Ovid in Exile

POWER AND POETIC REDRESS IN THE *TRISTIA* AND *EPISTULAE EX PONTO*

MATTHEW M. McGOWAN

MNEMOSYNE SUPPLEMENTS MONOGRAPHS ON GREEK AND ROMAN LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

BRILL

Ovid in Exile

Mnemosyne

Supplements

Monographs on Greek and
Roman Language and Literature

Editorial Board
G.J. Boter
A. Chaniotis
K.M. Coleman
I.J.F. de Jong
P.H. Schrijvers

VOLUME 309

Ovid in Exile

Power and Poetic Redress in
the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto*

By

Matthew M. McGowan

TUTA SUB AEGIDE PALLAS · 1683 ·

BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON
2009

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

McGowan, Matthew M.
Ovid in exile : power and poetic redress in the Tristia and Epistulae ex Ponto / by Matthew M. McGowan.
p. cm. -- (Mnemosyne supplements : monographs on Greek and Roman language and literature ; 309)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 978-90-04-17076-6 (hardback : alk. paper) 1. Ovid, 43 B.C.-17 or 18 A.D.--Exile. 2. Ovid, 43 B.C.-17 or 18 A.D. Tristia. 3. Ovid, 43 B.C.-17 or 18 A.D. Epistulae ex Ponto. 4. Ovid, 43 B.C.-17 or 18 A.D.--Homes and haunts--Romania--Constanta. 5. Constanta (Romania)--In literature. 6. Exiles--Rome--Biography. 7. Exile (Punishment) in literature. 8. Exiles in literature. 9. Poets, Latin--Biography. I. Title. II. Series.

PA6537.M34 2009
871'.01--dc22

2008053385

ISSN 0169-8958
ISBN 978 90 04 17076 6

Copyright 2009 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.
Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Hotei Publishing, IDC Publishers, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers and VSP.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill NV provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA.
Fees are subject to change.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

In Memoriam

Iosephi Delz et Seth Benardete

CONTENTS

Acknowledgments ix

Introduction. The Redress of Exile 1

Chapter One. Historical Reality and Poetic Representation 17
Myth and History 25

Chapter Two. Crimes and Punishments 37
The Law and Ovid 41
The *crimen* in *carmen* 55
Summary 61

Chapter Three. God and Man 63
Princeps Divus 65
Augustus *deus praesens* 84

Chapter Four. Religious Ritual and Poetic Devotion 93
Reading Religion 94
The cult of the Caesars 98
The *theologia tripertita* in Varro 107
di quoque carminibus si fas est dicere fiunt 112
Preliminary Conclusion 118

Chapter Five. Space, Justice, and the Legal Limits of Empire 121
Ius, Lex, and the Limits of Rome 133
Vates et Exul 151
Germanicus: *vates et princeps* 155
Summary 164

Chapter Six. *Ovidius Naso, poeta et exul* 169
Ovid and Homer 171
Ovid, Homer, and the *ira principis* 191
Ars, Ingenium, and the Representation of Lived Experience 197

Conclusion. The Exile's Last Word 203

Bibliography 217
Reference Works 217
Abbreviations in Bibliography.. 217
Authors 218

Index Locorum 233
Index Verborum 249
Index Rerum 253

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This book started as a dissertation, *Religion, law, and poetics in Ovid's* Tristia *and* Epistulae ex Ponto, at New York University. My greatest debt is to my advisor, Michèle Lowrie, whose keen judgment and steady guidance gave this project its seminal form. My readers, Phillip Mitsis and John Marincola, and examiners, Denis Feeney and Fritz Graf, offered critical advice and useful comments for revision. I have since profited from the chance to share my ideas with audiences at the APA, the University of Wisconsin at Madison, Duke University, The Johns Hopkins University, The College of Wooster, and Fordham University. For helpful comments on portions of the text I am grateful to Neil Coffee, Edith Foster, Gerald McGowan, Martin Helzle, John Kuhner, Dan McNerny, Rachel Sternberg, and Leah Whittington. For last-minute bibliography and good-natured *sodalitas* in Munich Andrew Zissos and Christopher van den Berg deserve thanks, as do Patrick Burns and Elizabeth D'Emic for help with formatting and indices. Finally, the uncommon acumen of Brill's anonymous reader has vastly improved this study and saved me from many an untoward *error*. Of course, the mistakes that remain are entirely my own.

I would be remiss if I did not mention two others who have been instrumental in shaping this study. Professor Seth Benardete passed away before he could see the results of what were untold hours of reading Latin and Greek with me at NYU. For his learning, wit, and love for his students I dedicate this book to his memory. I would also like to remember Professor Josef Delz, a palmary *Textkritiker*, who taught me in Basel and was later responsible for sending me to the *TLL*. Each in his own way has been a model for me and will remain so: *requiescat in pace uterque*.

A word on the Latin texts: I have followed Wheeler / Goold 1988^{2} (Loeb) for the *Tristia* and Richmond 1990 (Teubner) for the *Epistulae ex Ponto*. Where my readings diverge from these I have noted in the text or, more often, in the notes. Except where otherwise noted, all translations are my own. At the end of his autobiography the exiled Ovid says, *iure tibi grates, candide lector, ago*, and adds a few years later, *da ueniam scriptis*.

INTRODUCTION

THE REDRESS OF EXILE

> *mitia ius Vrbis si modo fata darent,*
> *quaeque mihi sola capitur nunc mente uoluptas,*
> *tunc oculis etiam percipienda foret.*
> *non ita caelitibus uisum est, et forsitan aequis:*
> *nam quid me poenae causa negata iuuet?*
> *mente tamen, quae sola loco non exulat, utar*
> *praetextam fasces aspiciamque tuam.*
>
> "If only the gentle fates would give me the right to be in Rome, the pleasure I now take from my mind alone would then be taken in by my eyes as well. The gods have decided otherwise, and perhaps they are just. For how would I benefit from denying that there is a reason for my punishment? Yet I shall use my mind, which alone is not in exile, and behold your consular robe and fasces."
>
> *Pont.* 4.9.36–42

In these verses, among the last he ever wrote, Ovid contemplates the justice of his exile even as he finds a way to overcome it: he lays claim to the power of his imagination to return to Rome and watch the poem's addressee, Graecinus, assume the consulship.[1] By setting his own poetic capacity over against imperial authority the poet offers an implicit challenge to the legal right of the Roman emperor to censor his writing and ban him from the city. Such a challenge makes up only part of Ovid's lengthy and variegated literary response to his exile, but it is perhaps the most important and the one that relates most closely to what the Irish poet Seamus Heaney has called the "redress of poetry."[2] By casting the poetic act as a mode of redress, that is, as a corrective and remedy for suffering, Heaney credits poetry with the capacity to respond to injustice, right a wrong, and offset the burden of

---

[1] The poem dates to late 15 AD, Evans 1983, 154; or early 16, Syme 1978, 43–44.

[2] "The Redress of Poetry" is the title of Heaney's 1989 inaugural lecture as Professor of Poetry at Oxford, reprinted in Heaney 1995.

political oppression both immediately and in the future. Nearly all the poems Ovid writes in exile are in some fashion concerned with poetry's redressive capacity as such and thus invite an interpretive approach that draws on Heaney's "idea of counterweighting, of balancing out the forces, of redress—tilting the scales of reality towards some transcendent equilibrium."[3] This study explores the notion of poetic redress in Ovid's *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* by analyzing the poet's representation of himself and the *princeps*, Augustus Caesar, against the historical background of Roman religion, law, and poetry.

From the start it is important to note that Ovid's relationship to Augustus on view in these poems depends on the problem of power. The question of who wields it and how it is exercised gives rise to the dynamic tension between poet and emperor that effectively sustains Ovid's creative output in exile. It would be misguided, however, to assume that Ovid openly opposes Augustus, an opposition that would have been pitifully one-sided and perhaps historically inconceivable.[4] The poet's position is in fact more precarious and nuanced here, as Ellen Oliensis has noted in her analysis of "Ovid's will to power" on display in *Metamorphoses* 6 and *Tristia* 4.[5] "In place of dissent and resistance (and the "Augustan" hierarchies those terms presuppose)," she writes, "I will be looking for envy, aggression, exaltation, and abasement: the see-saw rhetoric of an Ovidian game designed for two symmetrically confronted players."[6] Oliensis has found, I believe, a compelling approach to reading these poems that has also helped to shape the readings offered here. Yet as I see it, the prevailing "rivalry" she identifies lies just beneath the surface of an apparently abject submission on the part of the poet to the overwhelming power of the emperor. Their relationship is not so much symmetrical as imbalanced, and this

[3] Heaney 1995, 3, where the remark stems from his reflection on Simone Weil's *Gravity and Grace*.

[4] Raaflaub and Samons 1990, 448–454, on the notion of "political opposition" generally, 448: "neither the Greeks nor the Romans even had a term for [political opposition]; and in political life there was no proper place for it;" and under Augustus in particular, 454: "contrary to all expectations, opposition to Augustus was scattered, isolated, ineffective, and, overall, minimal." Cf. Little 1982, 343–344, 350.

[5] Oliensis 2004, 286, 317–319.

[6] Oliensis 2004, 286. As her work there, so does mine draw on the scholarship of Barchiesi 1997 and Hardie 2002a, as well as of Nugent 1990, Bretzigheimer 1991, Williams 1994, and Claassen 1999. See Davis 2006, 9–22, for a re-appraisal of the terms "pro-," "anti-," and "un-Augustan" in Ovidian scholarship and a helpful revaluation of the term "ideology."

imbalance permeates the exile poetry from the start of the *Tristia* to the end of the *Epistulae ex Ponto*.

The verses cited above, for example, from the last book of Ovid's exilic collection are reminiscent of his very first from exile in which he sends his book of verse back to the city he may no longer inhabit, *Tr.* 1.1.1–2:

> Parue—nec inuideo—sine me, liber, ibis in Vrbem,
> ei mihi, quod domino non licet ire tuo!
>
> You will go to Rome without me, little book, and I don't resent you for it. Oh me, that it's not permitted for your master to go!

The book takes Ovid's place in Rome and thus allows him to play upon what may be the quintessential feature of his poems from exile: poetic presence in place of physical absence.[7] As the poet's surrogate about to embark on a tour of the city, the bookroll itself is necessarily unpolished and forlorn to befit the misery of its exiled author, *Tr.* 1.1.3: *incultus qualem decet exulis esse*. The image of the shaggy scroll is meant to be humorous and the humor of the opening lines to his "Sad Songs" (*Tristia*) undercuts the poet's pathetic self-representation.[8] Throughout the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* Ovid presents himself as a wretched exile and contrite offender whose self-professed guilt implies resignation and defeat before the emperor. The poems themselves, however, circumvent his punishment and make public the poetry at least partly responsible for his banishment. There is a disjunction here between the surface and the subtext, between what the text says ("my punishment makes me guilty") and what the poet's representation of the circumstances of his exile suggests ("I have been unjustly punished by Augustus").[9] This disjunction is directly dependent on the imbalance in the poet's representation of his relationship to the *princeps*: on the surface Ovid has to admit abject inferiority even as he allows to linger between the lines an image of Augustus that puts the emperor's unchecked authority in a

[7] Claassen 1999, 12, on *sermo absentis* as "perhaps the single most important exilic form." On Ovid's evocation of "not only distance but dominion and domination" in *Tr.* 1.1.1–2, see Hexter 2007, 211.

[8] Amann 2006, 50–52. In general, his book offers a convincing typology of humor in the *Tristia*, and his findings apply readily to the *Epistulae ex Ponto* and even Ovid's earlier work.

[9] This disjunction—called "playing it both ways" by Stahl 2002—fundamentally shapes the argument in Hardie's *Ovid's Poetics of Illusion* (2002a) and lies at the core of the approach to reading Ovid's exile poetry best represented by Williams 1994 (esp. Ch. 2 & 5) and Claassen 1999.

dubious light.[10] Herein lies the divided impulse driving the poetic practice of the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto*: the text never says directly what it can imply more safely by suggestion and by the figured language of metaphor and allusion that comes naturally to poetry.[11] The present study sets out to analyze this problem on the basis of Ovid's representation of his relationship to Augustus, behind which lie more general imbalances between history and poetry, imperial piety and Ovidian wit, legal right and artistic expression and, ultimately, political authority and poetic immortality.

I shall touch here only briefly on the *Ibis*, Ovid's other exilic work, because as a piece of bitter invective against an unspecified detractor in Rome it differs significantly in tone from the acquiescent lament that characterizes most of the exile poetry. Of course, the unremitting anger and concomitant need to curse on view in the *Ibis* and other exilic poems form a fascinating sub-category to Ovid's output in exile,[12] and the concealed object of his attack here may well be Augustus.[13] Nevertheless, lament and the myriad forms it takes in these poems attract most of my attention in the readings that follow. In general, I proceed from the premise that exile in the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* is at once a place of genuine suffering *and* a metaphor for the marginalization of Ovid's poetry from Rome.[14] I intend to show how the poet exploits his predicament in exile by transforming an historical

---

[10] So also Bretzigheimer 1991, 75–76.

[11] Ahl 1984b, is seminal here for "figured speech" in antiquity. See Hinds 1987, 25, on Ovid's "rhetoric of ambiguity and innuendo;" and Claassen 1988 for an impassioned call to read Ovid's poems from exile as poetry as opposed to factual representations of reality. She poses a fundamental question, 161: "*Are what the exile appears to be saying, and what the poet intends to say, identical?*" (italics hers)

[12] *Tr.* 1.8; 3.11; 4.9; 5.8; *Pont.* 4.3. Williams 1996 offers an excellent study of the deep-seated melancholy behind the curse poems, the *Ibis* in particular.

[13] Oliensis 2004, 316 with n. 58, though see Housman 1972, 3.1040, cited below Ch. 6 n. 85.

[14] Although Latin writers before Ovid use *exilium*, *exul*, *exulare*, *fuga*, and *profugus* in a transferred sense, the terms are not commonly used metaphorically until the early Christian writers, for whom existence on earth (as opposed to heaven) is often drawn in terms of exile. Cf. *TLL* V.2.1490.61–71; 2100.80–2101.20, 2107.53–78; VI.1.1468.16–42; X.2.1738.11–19; e.g. Cic. *Mil.* 101: *exilium ibi esse putat, ubi virtuti non sit locus* "he believes that exile is there where there is no place for virtue;" *Rep.* 2.7: *cum manent corpore, animo tamen exulant et uagantur* "though in body they remain, in thought they wander off into exile;" Ov. *Met.* 9.409: *exul mentis domusque* "an exile from both his home and reason." On "intellectual concepts of exile," see Gaertner 2007, 10 with n. 46; on the importance of metaphor to Cicero's conception of exile, see Cohen 2007, 125–128; on the trope of exile in medieval Latin poetry, see Hexter 2002, 420–421 with n. 18.

reality into a metaphorical motif to create in verse a place of intellectual refuge that lies beyond the immediate control of the emperor and poses a challenge to his political authority in Rome.[15] The abiding paradox of Ovid's exile is that the very punishment meant to harm the poet in fact substantiates his position vis-à-vis his punisher, Caesar Augustus: political power to banish with impunity is effectively undercut by the power of poetry to immortalize its subject.[16] In the end, the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* construct the enduring image of a poet wrongfully exiled by a godlike ruler whose anger knew no bounds.

There is no fully satisfactory explanation for why Augustus took it upon himself to banish Ovid, although such a punishment ought to have attracted wide notice in Rome and throughout the empire.[17] In 8 AD the *princeps* sent Rome's most celebrated poet to Tomis, a former Milesian colony on the western coast of the Black Sea and the most important port on the empire's northeastern frontier.[18] Ovid kept his memory alive in the city by writing publicly about his experience in exile in the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto*.[19] These poems carefully construct the image of an exiled poet whose abject condition on the periphery of the Roman empire contrasts feebly with the pervasive presence of Augustus at its center.[20] Ovid emphasizes throughout that he is writing for a reprieve from a godlike emperor on whose whim a commutation of his sentence depends, just as it had been the emperor's

---

[15] Miller 2004, 229–230, speaks of Ovid creating "a realm of internal freedom through poetic transcendence and a writing of the self ... to serve as a locus of resistance." Similarly, the idea of "internal exile" or "*innere Emigration*" in Cicero's representation of exile has been explored by Doblhofer 1987, 231–241, and again Cohen 2007, 128 with n. 39.

[16] Boyle 2003, 11, on *Tr.* 1: "Permeating the book and interacting with its overt statements of imperial clemency and Ovidian remorse is a pattern of emphases, motifs, images, juxtapositions which not only articulate and underscore the collision between poetry and political power, but intimate the intrinsic superiority of the former and the arbitrariness and cruelty of the latter."

[17] Cf. Syme 1978, 215.

[18] Wilkes 1996, 569, 585. Cf. Nugent 1990, 239–245.

[19] The conventional dating is *Tr.* 1–5: 9–12 AD; *Pont.* 1–3: 13 AD; *Pont.* 4: 14–16 AD but published posthumously, c. 17–18 AD (*OCD*[3] "Ovid," 1086 [Hinds]). The *Ibis* falls between 10–12 AD, but see Häuptli 1996, 247–248, and Williams 1996, 7–8 and 132 n. 52, on the problems with dating that poem. On stylistic grounds some have ascribed the "double letters" of *Heroides* (16–21) to the exilic corpus, cf. Knox 1995, 6, with bibliography; on possible post-exilic revisions of the *Metamorphoses*, see Richmond 2002, 472–474; Kenney 1982, 444 n. 1; Pohlenz 1913; on the *Fasti* as an "exile-poem," see Boyle 1997, 7; Feeney 1992, 14–19; and cf. Syme 1978, 21 with n. 5.

[20] Hallett 2003, 345, 358–359, following Walker 1997, 195; Habinek 1998, 164.

arbitrary, Jupiter-like whim that sent the poet into exile. At first glance, indeed in the first poem of the collection, the relationship between the exile and the emperor is so dramatically unbalanced that the poet's very life appears beholden to the *princeps*, *Tr.* 1.1.20: *id quoque, quod uiuam, munus habere dei* "that I'm even alive I consider to be the gift of a god."[21] As a poet, however, Ovid continues to exercise in exile a power that the emperor and future god does not possess, a poetic power that tilts the scales of reality and redresses an imbalance in history. The competing forces of history and poetry, of actual military power and imagined poetic capacity, furnish the narrative subtext for Ovid's representation of his relationship to Augustus, a relationship that dominates both the surface and the essence of the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto*.

Both of these collections frequently have in common the form of the letter, and according to Ovid, the difference between the two is one of titles. Thus in the *Tristia* the poet conceals the names of the letter recipients whom he addresses openly by name in the *Epistulae ex Ponto*, *Pont.* 1.1.15–19:

> inuenies, quamuis non est miserabilis index,
> non minus hoc illo triste, quod ante dedi.
> rebus idem, titulo differt, et epistula cui sit
> non occultato nomine missa docet.

> Although the label is not wretched, you will find no less sadness in this collection than in the one I published before. Though the same in subject, they differ in title, and the letter itself reveals to whom it has been sent without hiding the name.[22]

Ovid acknowledges here that his poems from exile are often repetitive, and indeed the repetition of themes—sadness, isolation, poetic incapacity—becomes itself an oft-repeated theme throughout.[23] Again, this is meant to be humorous, and clearly the remorseful exile is also

---

[21] The god here is, of course, Augustus. The theme (called the *debitor uitae*-motif by Helzle 1989, 131) is repeated throughout the collection, e.g. in the penultimate poem, *Pont.* 4.15.3–4: *Caesaribus uitam, Sexto debere salutem / me sciat* "let him know that I owe my life to the Caesars, my well-being to Sextus."

[22] See Stroh 1981, 2640–2641 with n. 21.

[23] Cf. *Pont.* 3.7.3–4: *taedia consimili fieri de carmine uobis, / quidque petam cunctos edidicisse reor* "You're bored by my monotonous verse and, I suppose, have all learned by heart what I want;" 3.9.1–2; 3.9.39–42: *cum totiens eadem dicam, uix audior ulli, / uerbaque profectu dissimulata carent. / et tamen haec eadem cum sint, non scripsimus isdem, / unaque per plures uox mea temptat opem* "I so often say the same thing, though almost no one listens, and my words are left ignored and without effect. And though they're all the same, I've not written to the same people: my repetitive appeal looks to many for help."

the playful poet familiar from Ovid's earlier works. Indeed, this study will show how the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* fit into the whole of the Ovidian corpus, in particular the *Fasti* and *Metamorphoses*,[24] and thus within the larger Greco-Roman literary tradition of which the poet was so intent on becoming an integral part.[25]

Ovid of course attained his wish and has become in turn integral to the literary tradition that continues to inform the very idea of what poetry is and what place it holds in today's world. Few contemporary poets writing in English have engaged more directly or in a more sustained fashion with the classical past than Seamus Heaney, who has not surprisingly been at the forefront of our own era's "Ovid boom."[26] Thus I find it fitting to draw upon Heaney's notion of poetic redress for my own reading of Ovid's exile poetry. For when Heaney notes that "the redressing effect of poetry comes from its being a glimpsed alternative, a revelation of potential that is denied or constantly threatened by circumstances,"[27] he has in mind poetry written under exigent political circumstances, the kind of circumstances under which it is believed Ovid was banished from Rome by the emperor Augustus in 8 AD. Although the present state of our evidence prevents us from knowing with any certainty the actual reasons for his banishment, the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* nevertheless deliver poignant commentary on a notoriously tumultuous period in Roman history that witnessed the final phase in the rule of Rome's first emperor, Augustus, and the beginning of the reign of its second, Tiberius.[28] In these poems Ovid

[24] A classic study in this regard is Hinds 1985; see also Gaertner 2007a, 159–160; Oliensis 2004; Williams 2002a, 244–245; Hardie 2002b, 2 with n. 3; Claassen 2001, 11 n. 1; Boyle 1997; Rosenmeyer 1997, O'Gorman 1997 and Rahn 1958 in connection with the *Heroides*. Now also Johnson 2008, whose title is instructive, *Ovid Before Exile: Art and Punishment in the* Metamorphoses, and who uses the very fact of Ovid's exile as "evidence against a hospitable reception for art in late Augustan Rome" (20). Her conclusions (120–124) are consistent with the findings I offer here.

[25] Cf. Tarrant 2002, 30; Stroh 1981, 2648–2658.

[26] Michael Hofman and James Lasdun, the editors of *After Ovid* (1995, xi), to which Heaney himself has contributed fine re-shapings of the Orpheus tale (222–229), accurately use the word "boom" to define the increased interest in all things Ovidian in recent decades; cf. Ziolkowski 2005, 129. A concise summary of Heaney's use of the Classics generally can be found in Taplin 2002, 16–19, with bibliography.

[27] Heaney 1995, 4.

[28] Boyle 1997, 7; Feeney 1992, 21 n. 29, on *Fast.* 1.531–534: "Ovid is the first poet to write about one of the greatest novelties in Roman life, a novelty in some ways even greater than the principate itself: the succession to the principate." See also Williams 1978, 52; Hardie 2002c, 34.

presents himself as a conspicuous casualty of a shift in the course of Roman history from republic to principate, a personal tragedy tied to a very specific time and place. At the same time, the poet is aware of moving beyond the immediately historical here and aiming for something "transcendent"—to invoke the language of Heaney again—in writing his poetry from Tomis. As I shall demonstrate, the transcendent quality of the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* shows Ovid alive to the realization that his predicament is not peculiar to himself and that exile has the potential to touch all poets who practice their art under the threat of political persecution.

Of course, a verbal rejoinder in elegiac verse was destined to fall on deaf ears in Augustan Rome, and the poet's personal appeal to the emperor for a reprieve no doubt went blithely unheeded. Nevertheless, as the pendant to Ovid's representation of himself as a grief-stricken poet in exile, the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* also enshrine an image of the Roman *princeps* as an angry god of retribution. Ovid draws this image by engaging with both contemporary historical events and the tradition of Greek and Roman poetry. In what follows, I shall trace this engagement along several lines crucial for understanding Ovid's poetry generally and the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* in particular.

Readers of the exile poetry have always wanted to know, for example, which law the *princeps* invoked to banish the poet, and this question continues to fire an intense interest in the legal character of the charges against him.[29] My own interest in the law does not depend on answering this question definitively; I am concerned rather with Ovid's legal status in exile as part of the poetic representation of his condition there.[30] That representation also determines how both the poet and the

[29] E.g. Knox 2001; Goold 1983; Green 1982; Syme 1978, 199–229; Grasmück 1978, 135–136; Jones 1960, 14, 178 n. 42; Owen 1924, 1–47.

[30] This corresponds to a shift in scholarly focus over the last fifty years from the causes behind Ovid's banishment to the literary quality of the texts themselves. Emblematic of this shift are the two companions to Ovid published in 2002 by Cambridge (ed. P. Hardie) and Brill (ed. B. Weiden Boyd). In general, the papers from these two collections, from *Ramus* 1997 and from the *Festgabe* for Michael von Albrecht from 1999 show a willingness to engage with the poems from exile as literary endeavors on par with the rest of the Ovidian corpus, which is generally (though not in all cases, e.g. Lee 1959) less true of similar collections that appeared earlier: *Atti* 1959, *Ovidiana* 1959, and *Ovidianum* 1976. In addition, the not-so-recent past has produced several important book-length studies on the exile poetry: Froesch 1976; Nagle 1980; Videau-Delibes 1991; Williams 1994; and Claassen 1999, a substantial reworking of her important 1986 dissertation, *Poeta, exsul, vates*. All of these are indebted to the rehabilitation of the exile

emperor appear as quasi-mythical figures in these poems.[31] My reading of Ovid's mythologizing in exile draws on similar investigations into the interplay of myth and cult in the *Fasti* and the function of myth in the *Metamorphoses*.[32] The analysis of the religious aspects of the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* offered here is particularly welcome because these poems document for the first time in Latin literature worship within an inchoate form of the cult of the Caesars.[33] I shall consider this new development in the light of larger historical changes taking place within the legal, religious, and literary landscape of Roman culture.

The first chapter gives an historical overview of that landscape and offers an approach to negotiating the literary background informing these poems. It situates Ovid's exile poetry within the context of his Augustan predecessors and shows how the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* bear witness to the end of the transition from republic to principate and harbinger the imperial rule to come.[34] A characteristic feature of the early principate is the increasingly visible presence of the *princeps* in nearly every facet of the Roman state.[35] Ovid makes unflattering observations on this development in his poems from exile that are as new to Latin poetry as *Caesaris imperium* is new to Roman history.

The legal circumstances of the poet's banishment are the subject of the second chapter in which I examine the terms of the law Ovid uses to define his alleged transgression against the *princeps*. In view of the severe and public punishment he received, the poet's attitude appears to be paradoxical: he emphasizes the mildness of his (mis)deed but admits to have deserved the severity of its punishment. This paradox arises from Augustus' complex status in the exile poetry as both man and god: as a man he prosecutes the private injuries Ovid claims to have committed; as a god he attracts the public devotion Ovid purports to show. The dual nature of the *princeps* becomes problematic for the poet when Augustus' virtually state-sanctioned divinity begins to influence Roman legal procedure. In tones at once self-pitying and

---

poetry by Fränkel 1945 and Wilkinson 1955, and the articles of Rahn 1958, Kenney 1965b, and Stroh 1981.

[31] Claassen 1999, 68–72, is fundamental here; also Williams 1994, 193–201, esp. 200.

[32] On *Fast.*: Scheid 1992; Newlands 1995; Boyle 1997; Fantham 2002a; *ib.* 2002b; Green 2002; on *Met.*: Graf 1988; 1994; Feeney 1991.

[33] Heckel 2003 and below Ch. 4 96–107; cf. Gradel 2002, 202–203.

[34] Hardie 2002c, 35 with n. 5, and 45.

[35] E.g. Latte 1960, 305, on religion; Jolowicz 1972, 325, on the law; Wallace-Hadrill 1987, 226, on art.

ironic Ovid professes to understand that even a mild transgression requires profound contrition when the one transgressed is a god.

In the third chapter I consider Ovid's treatment of Augustus as a god both by analogy to Jupiter, the most powerful divinity in the exile poetry, and in his own right as a Caesar destined for deification by senatorial decree.[36] As the *Fasti* and *Metamorphoses* before them, the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* surpass the poems of Ovid's Augustan predecessors in referring to the *princeps* and his family as divine. This follows from an historical shift effected over the course of the first principate whereby reforms in religious practice gradually placed the figure of the *princeps* at the center of Roman religious discourse.[37] In Rome itself Augustus shied away from direct references to divinity during his lifetime and preferred allusions to a deification owed to him upon his death.[38] Outside the city, however, especially on the margins of the Roman world where Ovid spends his exile, the Caesars began to be worshipped as gods in an early form of the emperor cult.[39] The poet combines these newfound gods of the Roman state with the prominent figures of Greco-Roman myth to construct a unique (exilic) mythology that provides fitting expression to both the political reality in Rome and the poet's personal experience in Tomis.

Turning the *princeps* and his family into mythical divinities of the Roman state leads quite naturally to the ritual acts—sacrificial offerings and votive prayers—that serve to embellish Ovid's pious devotion to those gods. Thus my fourth chapter analyzes the poet's representation of religious ritual within a highly stylized literary prototype of the cult of the Caesars. This prototype itself marks an attempt on the part of the poet to fill the gap between the inchoate religion of the early principate at the center of the empire and the emperor worship alive on the periphery. Ovid's artful and witty reconstruction of his personal devotion to Augustus reflects more broadly the implicit contrast on view in these poems between poetic power and imperial authority, a contrast brought into vivid focus in *Pont.* 4.8. The conclusion here offers an interpretation of this poem against the theoretical background of the

---

36 Gradel 2002, 109–115, 261–304.

37 Beard-North-Price 1998, 1.169–170, 1.181–210; Galinsky 1996, 288; Gordon 1990; Beard 1987, 7; Fishwick 1987, 73–93; Liebeschuetz 1979, 61–90; Wissowa 1912, 73–78.

38 Gradel 2002, 109, 265; Weinstock 1971, 305, 408; Taylor 1931, 162–167; Wissowa 1912, 73.

39 Pippidi 1977, 250; Wilkes 1996, 569; cf. Gradel 2002, 73–108.

theologia tripertita—a tripartite division of the gods among poets, priests, and philosophers—found in Varro's *Res Diuinae*.[40]

The fifth chapter considers my findings on law and religion in light of the poet's emphasis in these poems on his geographical separation from Rome. I suggest that Ovid's physical exile also enables him to establish an empowering, metaphorical distance from the emperor's control. As a metaphor, exile neatly captures the poet's glaring lack of imperial favor, and his figurative displacement appears to emerge from these poems in the recurring contrast between the terms *ius* and *fas*. Thus I analyze here several passages where *ius* and, by extension, *lex* apply to the legal rule in Rome that has made Ovid an *exul* and where *fas* refers to the poetic space of the sacred *uates*. Ultimately, the terms *fas* and *uates* become vital to the poet in exile because they provide him with a sacred right to speak that does not depend on his relationship to the *princeps* and lies outside the purview—both actual and imagined—of Roman imperial jurisdiction.

In the sixth chapter, I examine how the exiled Ovid identifies himself with Homer and Ulysses.[41] This identification results, on one level, from the immense degree of suffering the ancients connected with the former's poetry and the latter's mythical experiences, a suffering Ovid claims to outdo in exile. On another level, the prominence of these two figures in the literary tradition of Greece and Rome made them ideal models for a poet intent on making his name within that tradition. Ovid presents himself as a composite of Homer as poet and Ulysses as exile in order to make a claim for the validity of his art both in relation to the changed political situation in Rome under Augustus and within the history of literature. By identifying himself with such paradigmatic figures from the literary tradition, the poet and exile effectively collapses the distance between poetic representation and actual experience: a defense of his person before the *princeps* amounts to a defense of the art of poetry itself.

---

[40] Lieberg 1973, 106–107; Green 2002 on "Varro's three theologies" in Ovid's *Fasti*.

[41] Ulysses is perhaps more readily associated with return (νόστος) than with banishment (φυγή), but he exhibits the distinguishing characteristic of the exile, the absence from home, an absence he maintains through disguise while in Ithaca. In addition, for both Ulysses and Ovid the anger of a god is responsible for the separation from home, e.g. *Tr.* 1.5.78: *illum* [sc. Vlixem] *Neptuni, me* [sc. Nasonem] *Iouis ira premit* "Ulysses was harried by Neptune's anger, as I am now by Jupiter's;" and cf. *Tr.* 3.11.61–62: *crede mihi, si sit nobis collatus Vlixes, / Neptuni minor est quam Iouis ira fuit* "compare Ulysses to me: believe me, Neptune's anger is less than Jupiter's has been."

In the book's conclusion I revisit more fully Heaney's idea of poetry as redress in light of my own reading of exile as a metaphorical motif in these poems. I suggest that in exile Ovid undergoes a profound transformation as a poet, now eternally banished and fundamentally changed, not entirely unlike the figures of his mytho-historical epic. To interpret his poetic metamorphosis in exile, Ovid maps his personal experience onto myth and in so doing bears witness to the changes Augustus introduced over some four decades, for example, to Rome's civil religion and legal procedure.[42] At the same time, he is clearly aware that these changes inevitably affect other poets in the city and that the Augustan revolution has come to shape the language, style, and subject matter of poetry itself. In Heaney's formulation, Ovid's "revelation of poetic potential" is the understanding that emperor's presence is ubiquitous; ultimately, the poet teaches us, the *princeps* determines whether Roman poets live or die.

Indeed, exile became such a common punishment in antiquity precisely because it offered an alternative to execution.[43] Fittingly, Ovid often likens his exile to a living death, and he is at pains to recreate in verse the death he escaped by leaving Rome.[44] In a sense, these poems fulfill the poet's claim from the end of the *Metamorphoses* (15.871–879) to live on after death in the mouths of men. It is an irony worthy of Ovid that the fulfillment of death defeated does not depend on the longevity of his verse but comes while he is yet alive. In effect, the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* reify the poet's immortality at Rome; they speak on

---

[42] On Ovid's personal identification with mythic paradigms, see Claassen 2001, 32–34; Nisbet 1982, 51–52; although Davisson 1993, 224–237, argues that the paradigmatic function of myth often fails Ovid in exile.

[43] Kelly 2006, 1–2; Grasmück 1978, 146.

[44] E.g. *Tr.* 3.11.25–26: *non sum ego quod fueram: quid inanem proteris umbram? / quid cinerem saxis bustaque nostra petis*? "I'm not what I was: why trample an empty shade? Why attack my ash and tomb with rocks?" *Pont.* 1.2.28: *et similis morti pectora torpor habet* "my heart is held by a deathlike torpor;" 1.5.85–86: *uosque, quibus perii, tum cum mea fama sepulta est, / nunc quoque de nostra morte tacere reor* "and I imagine that you for whom I died when my reputation was buried, now also remain silent about my death;" 1.7.9–10: *nos satis est inter glaciem Scythicasque sagittas / uiuere, si uita est mortis habenda genus* "enough for me to live amid the ice and Scythian arrows, if a kind of death is to be taken for a life." Further, his departure for exile is like a funeral, *Tr.* 1.3.22; 3.14.20; 5.1.13–14; *Pont.* 2.3.3; Tomis sits on the Styx, *Tr.* 5.9.19; *Pont.* 1.8.27; 4.9.74; the poet writes his own epitaph, *Tr.* 3.3.73–76, on which see below n. 45. On the recurring theme of exile as equivalent to death, see Gaertner 2007a, 160 with n. 26; Claassen 1999, 239–241 with n. 37; Williams 1994, 12–13; Helzle 1988, 78; Nagle 1980, 23–35, Owen 1902, 99, on *Tr.* 1.2.72. Cf. Cic. *Att.* 3.7.2; *Fam.* 14.4.3.

his behalf in the city of the Caesars he can no longer inhabit and offer themselves as an extended epitaph there for his plight in Tomis.[45] As is apt for the elegiac epitaph, the poet addresses himself to his readership in posterity, *Tr.* 4.10.2: *accipe posteritas*. What Ovid makes explicit here in the opening distich of his autobiography holds for the whole of the exilic corpus: these poems erect for the reader a metaphorical monument to the poet's predicament in exile *and* Augustus' act of unmitigated anger that brought it about.

Few contemporary Romans already familiar with Ovid's work could have failed to notice in reading these poems how, in exile at the end of his life, the city's most versatile poet had dedicated himself almost exclusively to lament. Not surprisingly, Ovid himself professes to take a certain delight in bemoaning his own misery.[46] His fondness for lament and its concomitant tears suggests that, as *poeta doctus*, Ovid is interested in allowing form and content to convene in true elegies on the abject state of the exile and thus in returning the meter of elegy to its original function of lamentation.[47] Form entails meaning in the exile poetry, and the match of meter to subject matter belongs to the poet's attempt to find the most fitting mode for expressing his personal anguish in exile. Ovid seems to have recognized at the outset of his banishment that these poems would be his last, and he even calls them his swan-song.[48] He reaches back to the literary past, to the perceived origin of elegy, and attempts to bring together meter and subject matter. In doing so, he turns his condition in exile into an occasion for artistic expression

[45] Similarly Herescu 1958, "Le Sens de l'epitaph ovidienne," esp. 440; and see *Tr.* 3.3.73–76, the poet's self-composed epitaph in which the play on the *redende Inschrift* of the funerary epigram is unmistakable, on which below 166 with n. 94; 198.

[46] Cf. *Tr.* 4.3.37–38: *fleque meos casus: est quaedam flere uoluptas: / expletur lacrimis egeriturque dolor* "weep for my misfortune: there is a certain pleasure in weeping: grief is sated and worked out by tears." See Stroh 1971, 32 n. 71, on the *uoluptas flendi* topos in Roman elegy.

[47] E.g. *Tr.* 5.1.5–6: *flebilis ut noster status est, ita flebile carmen, / materiae scripto conueniente suae* "as my condition is lamentable, so is my song a lament; the writing is suited to its subject matter;" cf. Helzle 1989, 14; Harrison 2002, 81 with n. 13. On the conventional connection of elegy with death via Greek ἔλεγος "sung lament" see Alexiou 1974, 104; West 1974, 4–5. On genre-bending in Ovid's elegies from exile, see Miller 2004, 211 with notes 1–5 for bibliography.

[48] Cf. *Tr.* 4.8.1: *iam mea cycneas imitantur tempora plumas* "my brow already sports the color of a swan's feathers;" 5.1.11–14: *utque iacens ripa deflere Caystrius ales / dicitur ore suam deficiente necem / sic ego, Sarmaticas longe proiectus in oras, / efficio tacitum ne mihi funus eat* "as the swan, lying on the banks of the Caÿster, is said to lament its own death with failing voice, so do I, cast forth onto distant Sarmatian shores, make sure my funeral does not go quietly."

where a fundamental principle of Ovidian poetics still applies, *Met.* 10.252: *ars adeo latet arte sua* "by its own art is thus art concealed."

The artistry of the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* does not differ greatly from that of the rest of the Ovidian corpus, despite the poet's claim to the contrary and his frequent lament for the deterioration of the quality of his verse in exile.[49] As has been pointed out by recent critics of the exile poetry, there is a marked disjunction here between what the poet says ("my poetic skill has deteriorated in Tomis") and what a close reading reveals to be the case ("these poems are as successful as any in the Ovidian corpus").[50] A similar disjunction between the surface and the subtext applies to Ovid's representation of his relationship to Augustus: the poet's insistence on his own guilt and his ensuing submissiveness before the emperor are both consistently undercut by the lingering image of a capricious autocrat whose anger knew no bounds.[51] In the wake of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, this image may no longer have been a novelty at Rome. Yet coming from the hand of a political exile on the margins of the empire it is as new to the city as the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* are new to the Greco-Roman literary tradition.[52]

---

[49] *Tr.* 1.1.35–36; 1.11.35–44; 3.1.17–18; 3.14.25–26; 4.1.1; 5.1.69–74: *'at mala sunt' fateor. quis te mala sumere cogit? / aut quis deceptum ponere sumpta uetat? / ipse non emendo, sed ut hic deducta legantur; / non sunt illa suo barbariora loco / nec me Roma suis debet conferre poetis: / inter Sauromatas ingeniosus eram* "'But they're bad poems', I admit. Who's forcing you to read them? Or forbidding you in your disappointment to set aside such reading? I myself don't emend them, but let them be read as written here: they are no more barbarous than their place of origin. Rome should not compare me to her own poets: among Sarmatians I have become a genius;" 5.7.55–56; 5.12.33–34; *Pont.* 3.4.33–34; 3.9.47–56, esp. 55–56: *da ueniam scriptis, quorum non gloria nobis / causa, sed utilitas officiumque fuit* "excuse what I've written, which I did not for glory but because I had to for expediency."

[50] For a good summary of the terms of the debate, see Williams 2002b, 357–360. More generally, Williams 1994, 50–99; Claassen 1989a, 362–364; and Nagle 1980, 109–120, on "deterioration" as a poetic motif. For a contrary view, see Gaertner 2007a, 161–172, esp. 169 with n. 77.

[51] Cf. Heckel, 2003, 93. In general, my argument here draws on Nugent 1990, e.g. 240: "The metaphysics of Ovid's epic work warns us that only rarely can interior dispositions be reliably read from external forms. Most often, the interplay between surface and essence is both richer and more deceptive. And so it is with Ovid's poetry and his politics; it is a foolhardy reader who thinks to discern one readily from the other—yet the effort toward that discernment must be made." Nugent herself builds on the important work of Marache 1958, Marg 1959, Wiedemann 1975, and Doblhofer 1987, and points ahead to Barchiesi 1997. Cf. Claassen 1991, 39–40, where she speaks of "un niveau plus profond où le poète (exilé) s'exprime sincèrement."

[52] Hexter 2002, 417: "Ovid's *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* were unique in their day, born of unique circumstances." Cf. Stroh 1981, 2638–2639, 2645; Liveley 2005, 104.

Recent scholarship on the literary reception of the exile poetry has noted how Ovid has assumed a central place in the early tradition of exile literature—he has been called in another context "the *Ur*-exile"[53]—and his influence on contemporary poets of exile continues unabated.[54] The present study draws on the reception of Ovid's exile poetry among contemporary writers—including Heaney—in reading his extended lament for his personal trauma in Tomis as a defense of the art of poetry itself. By turning his punishment into a poetic motif in the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* Ovid offers an implicit challenge to the emperor's display of political power: what is ostensibly an end for Augustus (out of sight, out of mind) becomes a means for Ovid (poetic presence through physical absence). Put another way, far from silencing him at Rome, the punishment of exile furnishes Ovid with an exceptional kind of disembodied presence made more powerful by virtue of the poet's conspicuous absence from the city.

Ovid's disembodied, exilic voice on the lips of his readers—both ancient and modern—is a purely poetic presence. Indeed, it comes from an imagined place of intellectual refuge beyond the control of the emperor, where the poet can reflect out loud on how and why his own art has been legally banished and left for dead on the margins of the empire. As the last of the Augustan poets, Ovid is in a unique position to take stock of his own standing and of the place of poetry itself in a Rome deeply restructured during the lengthy rule of the city's first emperor.[55] On the surface, Ovid's use of exile as a poetic motif implies flight from the *princeps*, just as his avowed contrition suggests resignation to his wretched condition. Beneath the surface, however, the poet offers pointed criticism of Augustus' restructuring of Roman society. Here, in the essence of a text whose mere existence is its own best defense, exile becomes for Ovid a powerful source of poetic redress for the historical circumstances that made his banishment possible.

---

53 Ziolkowski 2005, 101–111.

54 See Ziolkowski 2005; Hardie 2002a, 326–337; Kennedy 2002; Claassen 1999, 241–258; Barchiesi 1997, 1–5; Little 1990, 26–27; Smolak 1980; Froesch 1976, 114–145; and cf. Hexter 2007; Hexter 1986, 83–136.

55 Syme 1978, 168: "For the enquirer in these late days, the *Epistulae ex Ponto* contribute powerfully to an understanding of life and letters in the time of Augustus Caesar, especially valuable because of the dearth of contemporary evidence for the last epoch of the reign. It is not merely the useful details about persons and events, permitting close dates and references. Ovid illustrates the language in current use for homage towards ruler and dynasty. In general and above all, he is a necessary counterpart to the poets whom the government liked and rewarded."

CHAPTER ONE

HISTORICAL REALITY AND POETIC REPRESENTATION

> "Much of the exile's life is taken up with compensating for disorienting loss by creating a new world to rule. ... The exile's new world, logically enough, is unnatural and its unreality resembles fiction."
>
> – Edward W. Said, "Reflections on Exile" (1984)[1]
>
> *quia res est publica Caesar*
>
> "Since Caesar is the state."
>
> *Tr.* 4.4.15

When he was banished sometime in the fall of the year 8 AD, Ovid was at the height of his fame, having completed the sixth book of his *Fasti* and nearing the end of the *Metamorphoses*. At this time the Augustan principate was besieged by turmoil from within and outside: murder plots, natural and military disasters, and personal and political losses between 4–9 AD had brought the emperor to the brink of suicide.[2] To read Sir Ronald Syme, the last decade of Augustus' rule (4–14 AD) was shrouded in "an atmosphere of gloom and repression."[3] Gloom may well apply to any era, especially in the eyes of an avowed Tacitist such as Syme, but repression points to a fundamental difference in the historical circumstances under which the Augustan poets lived. The crisis of 23/22 BC brought about by the conspiracy of Caepio and Murena was indeed dire,[4] but it could never have occurred to the *princeps* then to ban a book of Horace or banish Vergil. This is not

---

[1] Said 2000, 181.

[2] Plin. *Nat.* 7.149, and more generally, Dio 55.22–34. Cf. Helzle 2003, 31; Boyle 1997, 7 n. 3; Syme 1978, 169–229; Wiedemann 1975, 265–269, and for a concise overview of the contemporaneous political climate in Rome and Ovid's place therein, see Gaertner 2005, 8–24; Berrino and Luisi 2002, 23–28.

[3] Syme 1978, 205.

[4] See Raaflaub and Samons 1990, 425–426, for a summary with bibliography.

necessarily because of what they wrote, but rather because of when they were writing.[5] The Roman poets of the generation before Ovid knew to savor peace after a spate of protracted civil wars to which they and the Roman world had grown accustomed. Unlike Ovid, they were never subjected to the "repression" of Augustus' later, increasingly autocratic years. As a member of the landed aristocracy (*domi nobilis*) from an important *municipium* (Sulmo), Ovid had only to enjoy the fruits of the peace that came with the consolidation of power into the hands of a single ruler at Rome.[6] In contrast to his Augustan predecessors he never faced the dilemma between "liberty or stable government," as Syme famously phrased it in the preface to his *Roman Revolution*.[7] Yet history made Ovid both a beneficiary of a new phase in Roman government that had enabled his literary success *and* a notorious casualty of the despotic prerogative of an aging *princeps*.[8] When Ovid was about fifty years of age and the most popular poet in Rome, the emperor Augustus banished him to the city of Tomis on the western coast of the Black Sea.

Tomis, modern Constanța, Romania, had been a prosperous trading colony of the Ionian city of Miletus from as early as the sixth century BC and was in the Augustan period the principal port of the western portion of the Black Sea region.[9] Ovid himself notes that Tomis marked the most newly acquired point of Augustan imperial expansion while he was in exile, *Tr.* 2.199–200:

---

[5] As Johnson 2008, 4, has already observed of Horace and Ovid; cf. Little 1982, 346.

[6] Millar 1993, 5–6.

[7] Syme 1939, viii.

[8] Knox 2001 wants to see Tiberius behind Ovid's exile, which allows him to compare the notorius case of Clutorius Priscus, perhaps the very Priscus mentioned by Ovid in *Pont.* 4.16.10. Priscus had been rewarded by Tiberius for his poem on the occasion of Germanicus' death in 19 and in the interest of further gain composed another poem prematurely commemorating the death of the emperor's own son, Drusus, when he fell ill. He foolishly recited the poem in the company of some Roman matrons and was subsequently denounced and convicted of *maiestas* by the senate in 21. Despite the intervention of a few supporters and the absence of Tiberius from Rome during the incident, Priscus was murdered in prison quickly after the trial (Tac. *Ann.* 3.49–51; Dio 57.20.3–4; *PIR*^{2}, C 1199). Knox suggests that it may have been Ovid's panegyrical digression at *Ars* 1.177–228 on the military exploits of the young Gaius Caesar, whom Augustus would have preferred as his successor, that rubbed Tiberius the wrong way, stating, 181: "Con Tiberio … non ci voleva molto."

[9] Wilkes 1996, 569, 585.

haec est Ausonio sub iure nouissima, uixque
haeret in imperii margine terra tui.

This is the most recently acquired land under Italian rule and scarcely clings to the border of your [Augustus'] empire.

This assertion is likely to be true, but the reader of the exile poetry ought to be cautious in using Ovid as an historical source for the place of his banishment.[10] Other, primarily epigraphical sources indicate that at the time of the poet's exile Tomis defined the margin of the Roman world in a territory that later became known as the province of Moesia.[11] As we shall see, it is integral to Ovid's poetic program in exile to be able to represent the place of his banishment as coterminous with the limit of civilization and the end of the earth, as for example in *Pont.* 2.7.66: *ultima me tellus, ultimus orbis habet* "I'm held at the end of the earth, at the end of the world."[12]

Understanding Ovid's exile as a poetic place, a literary construct deeply informed by an actual reality, is crucial to seeing the way in which the poet uses a coincidence of history to his own rhetorical advantage in these poems. The historical place of his exile allows Ovid to establish an empowering poetic identity whereby the poet on the edge of civilization comes into contact with what is specifically not known in Rome.[13] His newfound position on the margins of the empire gives him, paradoxically in view of the professed wretchedness of his physical and mental state, power through poetic knowledge. From exile in Tomis the poet gains a critical perspective from which to comment on the Augustan, and thus the first, phase of the Roman principate.[14] Ovid assumes a didactic role here, and this is one of the more profound ironies of his exile: the very thing which forces the poet to confront the

---

[10] Gaertner 2005, 24; Williams 1994, 4–8 with n. 4; Podossinov 1987, 203. For general criticism of the "historicist" approach to reading Ovid's exile poetry, see Claassen 1988, 158–161, with bibliography.

[11] When the Romans started calling this region Moesia is uncertain, but it appears to have become a separate province in 44 AD; cf. Nawotka 1997, 54–55 with n. 222; Wilkes 1996, 567 with n. 54; Syme 1934, 123: "The dispute is one of names (Moesia is not mentioned in Augustan literature) . . . the name may be later, the thing was not."

[12] Cf. *Tr.* 4.9.9: *sim licet extremum, sicut sum, missus in orbem* "Though banished to the farthest reaches of the world, as I have been." Further parallels in Kettemann 1999, 722.

[13] See also Habinek 1998, 164; Walker 1997, 195; and the provocative article of Boyle 1997.

[14] See the insightful remarks about Roman military control—or lack thereof—on the lower Danube in Grebe 2004, 117–119; cf. Williams 1994, 184–186.

limits of the known physical world is also what makes it possible for him to probe the boundaries of poetic creativity and, ultimately, to educate the Romans he has been forced to leave about the precarious fate of poets in the city recently re-founded by Augustus.

The reasons why Augustus sent Ovid into exile continue to confound critics and will likely always remain shrouded in mystery. Without any trustworthy corroborating historical evidence the modern reader is thus forced to rely solely on the poems themselves in attempting to grasp the circumstances of the poet's exile. Ovid claims, for example, that he was banished—or rather "relegated"[15]—to the Black Sea personally by the emperor on two charges, a poem and a mistake (*Tr.* 2.207: *duo crimina, carmen et error*). The poem, he tells us on several occasions, was the *Ars Amatoria*; the exact nature of the mistake he never reveals.[16] A full explanation of the causes behind Ovid's exile, it seems, has been trumped by history; for no solution to the problem, however ingenious, can lay claim to certainty and few have ever met with approval for long.[17] Not surprisingly, there have been attempts to show that Ovid was never actually banished and that his exile is a poetic fiction.[18] Such an elaborate fiction, however, without precedent or parallel in antiquity, is improbable even for Ovid. Nevertheless, I shall admit with Heinz Hofmann that "these poems do not permit us *any*

[15] *Tr.* 2.137: *quippe relegatus, non exul, dicor in illo* [edicto] "Indeed, in your edict I'm said to be 'relegated', not 'exiled';" cf. *Tr.* 1.7.8; 5.2.17; 5.11.21; *Pont.* 4.15.2 and Ciccarelli 2003, 126 ad *Tr.* 2.137: "In questo caso ... la distinzione tra *exul* e *relegatus* cela un intento polemico: al poeta, infatti, poco importa il significato giuridico dei due termini, poiché nella sua condizione *relegatus* è solo un eufemismo che cela una pena dura e dolorosa al pari dell'*exilium.*" See also below, Ch. 2 51 with nn. 57 and 59.

[16] On the *Ars* as one of the contributing causes of his exile, *Tr.* 1.1.67–68; 2.212; 2.345–347; 2.539–546; 5.12.67–68: *sic utinam, quae nil metuentem tale magistrum / perdidit, in cineres Ars mea uersa foret!* "would that I had burned my *Art*, which has destroyed its master who feared nothing of this kind!" *Pont.* 2.9.75–76. On the silence he must keep regarding his error, *Tr.* 2.207–208: *perdiderint cum me duo crimina, carmen et error, / alterius facti culpa silenda mihi* "though charges for two crimes have brought me to ruin—a poem and a mistake—I must keep silent the fault of the latter deed;" 4.10.99–100. See below Ch. 2 38–39.

[17] Thibault 1964 catalogues well over one hundred attempts since 400 AD to solve the mystery of Ovid's exile and is forced to conclude, 121: "none is completely satisfactory ... certainty can never be attained on the basis of our present resources." Verdière 1992 and Berrino and Luisi 2002 provide more recent bibliographical survey of the issue, to which add Knox 2001 on Tiberius as the *de facto* enforcer of Ovid's exile.

[18] Fitton Brown 1985; Hartman 1905, 70. For a summary of the *Fiktionsthese*, Chwalek 1996, 28–31; and for clear arguments against it, Little 1990, 29–39.

conclusions about the reality (in the sense of historical fact) of the statements and assertions put forward in them."[19]

If the historical facts of Ovid's exile will always be debatable, so too will the details and interpretation of the epochal transition in Roman history from republic to principate during which it took place. A full discussion of that transition lies beyond the scope of this study, for which I have nevertheless sought throughout to provide adequate and specific historical documentation to contextualize the individual analyses of Ovid's texts below. To be sure, this study's overall argument has been shaped by some more broadly accepted notions—of course, themselves always open to debate and revaluation—about the first principate and the era in which Ovid wrote. It seems clear, for example, that even as Augustus orchestrated the refounding of the republic by assiduously cultivating its forms and ideals, he nevertheless took unprecedented control of the running of the state.[20] Through a politic adaptation of form and ideology and a shrewd negotiation of public and private space he gave the appearance of perpetuating the existing order of things while at the same time reinforcing his own position and ensuring the prospects of his appointed successor.[21] In theory the republic continued to exist; in practice the political workings of the state were conducted in an unprecedented fashion so that Rome became an upstart monarchy wrapped in republican garb.[22]

There is much of the new wrapped in the old in the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto*. For example, these poems are still familiar elegies on the poet as *miser*, a traditional *topos* at Rome for the elegiac genre.[23] In addition, they often present exile through the medium of the letter

---

[19] 1987, 23. (his emphasis) See Oliensis 2004, 319, for an impassioned rebuttal of the suggestion that Ovid was never actually relegated but created a poetic fiction of exile.

[20] On forms and ideals: Wallace-Hadrill 1982; ib. 1990; Jolowicz and Nicholas 1972; Latte 1960. For an alternative view, cf. Galinsky 1996. On Augustus' control in running the state: Galinksky 1996, 10–20, 42–49, 77–79; Tellegen-Couperus 1993, 75–76. Cf. also *OCD*[3] s.v. "Augustus," 218 (N. Purcell): "[Augustus gave] his name to far more *leges* than any legislator before him."

[21] Cf. Brunt and Moore 1967, 16, on Augustus and the republican framework. On giving the appearance that the existing order of things was still in operation, cf. Davis 2006, Ch. 2 "Augustan Ideology," esp. 48; Kienast 1999, 519–524; Jolowicz and Nicholas 1972, 342–344; Jones 1960, 3, 17.

[22] The title of Kienast 1999, *Augustus: Prinzeps und Monarch*, is instructive about where the author stands on Augustus' political reshaping of the Roman state.

[23] See Nagle 1980, 43–70, e.g. 57, on *miser* as a conventional sobriquet for the elegiac lover, and 64–69 n. 112, for a handy catalogue of terms Ovid uses in the exile poetry that are common to Roman love elegy.

with frequent references to famous figures from the Greek and Latin literary tradition.[24] Ovid claims to have invented a new genre of poetry with the elegiac epistles of the *Heroides, Ars* 3.346: *ignotum hoc aliis ille nouauit opus* "that work he devised anew was unknown to others." Of course, the verse epistle had already appeared at Rome in the poetry of Lucilius (fr. 181–188, 341 Marx) from the late second century BC and in Catullus (35, 68 [and 65?]) in the middle of the next century before Horace wrote an entire *Gedichtbuch* of letters, *Epistles* I, sometime shortly after the publication of his *Odes* I–III in 23 BC.[25] It is debatable whether Propertius' Arethusa-letter from his fourth and final book of elegies pre- or post-dates the composition of the *Heroides*,[26] but clearly in all Roman letters other than Ovid's both the writers and their intended readers were presented as historical personages (regardless of whether the letters were ever actually sent). Ovid innovated in the *Heroides* by using the epistolary form to invent writers and recipients from the store of Greek and Roman myth. The imagined voices of his mythical

[24] E.g. *Tr.* 1.1.47–48: *da mihi Maeoniden et tot circumice casus, / ingenium tantis excidet omne malis* "Let's take Homer, for example, and throw as many misfortunes about him; all his genius will fall away amid such great suffering;" 1.5.57–58: *pro duce Neritio, docti, mala nostra, poetae, / scribite: Neritio nam mala plura tuli* "Write, learned poets, about my misfortunes instead of Ulysses'; for I've suffered more ills than he;" and see below 177. Rahn 1958, 115, recognizes "*die Odysseus-Rolle* als Beispiel für das Neue, das die Spätform der elegischen Epistel kennzeichnet." (emphasis his)

[25] Certain epistolary invitations in verse are extant in Greek (*Anth. Pal.* 6.222; 11.44 [Philodemus to Piso]), but the verse epistle is conspicuously absent from the Greek tradition through the Hellenistic period. The study of Rosenmeyer 2001, *Ancient Epistolary Fictions*, debunks the myth promoted by Ovid that he "invented" the genre of the verse epistle. She argues (12), moreover, against the use of the term "verse letter," stating that "difference between verse and prose … is less crucial in an epistolary context than the difference between fictive or imaginative letters and letters whose writers or receivers are not invented." Regarding *Tr.* and *Pont.* she notes, "[Ovid's] whole programme depended on Augustus' belief in the veracity of his representation of himself as miserable in exile." This is different, so Rosenmeyer, from the *Heroides* where "both writers and intended readers are inventions from myth and literature." But the historical personages that Ovid places in his letters, including himself and the emperor, become literary conventions and in a certain sense "inventions" for the sake of the poems. Hence, the distance between the patent fictionality of the *Heroides* and historical "reality" of the exile poetry is not so great, as Rosenmeyer herself argues in Rosenmeyer 1997, 51: "Whether the writer claims to write in his own voice or that of a mythical figure, the moment he puts words to paper he invents a self, a life, a set of feelings." On the importance of ancient epistolographic theory to Ovid's exile poetry, cf. Gaertner 2007a, 168–172.

[26] Hutchinson 2006, 101: "It is most natural to see Ovid's Heroides as making a further shift [from a female first person], into mythological time; but one cannot actually prove P.'s priority, plausible as it seems."

heroines (and their lovers in *Ep.* 16, 18, and 20) recreate with the form of the letter the pathos they traditionally experienced in myth. In the exile poetry Ovid continues to innovate by bringing into the verse epistle the pathos he presents himself as having personally suffered. The form remains the elegy on the abject state of the suffering author, but the subject changes from myth to personal experience. To put it another way, from the *Heroides* to the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* Ovid moves from the strictly mythical to a combination of the mythical and historical.

As a metrical form the elegiac distich was connected historically with lament, and lament, as in the title *Tristia* (sc. *carmina*), fills these poems from first to last. It is part of Ovid's project in the exile poetry to restore the generic validity of meter by allowing form and content to convene, as he says in *Tr.* 5.1.5–6:

> flebilis ut noster status est, ita flebile carmen,
>   materiae scripto conueniente suae.

> As my condition is lamentable, so is my song a lament; the writing is suited to its subject matter.

The professed match of the meter to its subject matter allows Ovid to imply that the distance between poetic representation and lived experience has effectively collapsed. It also reveals the poet's concern with the significance of form *in se*. Indeed, the form of the verse epistle provides Ovid with the means to maintain an intimate tone fit for private correspondence. The mere publication of these poems, however, explodes the fallacy of intimacy they attempt to create, and Ovid's ostensibly private response to his exile becomes in fact part of the public domain at Rome.[27] In a similar turn in politics, the private concerns of the family of Augustus became inextricable from the public good, *Pont.* 2.1.18: *priuati nil habet illa domus* [sc. Caesarea] "that house of the Caesars holds nothing private." Turning the private house of the *princeps* into the ruling family at Rome firmly establishes the principate and allows for a smooth transition in the first succession. Augustus was able to

[27] As the title of Evans' 1983, *Publica Carmina: Ovid's Books from Exile*, seeks to emphasize. It ought to be noted that the phrase *animos ad publica carmina flexi* (*Tr.* 5.1.23), whence Evans takes his title, has been emended by Hall 1995 (and printed in the most recent edition of Wheeler and Goold): *numeros pudibunda ad carmina flexi* "I've turned my verse-making to shame-faced songs." For Shackleton Bailey 1982, 395, the phrase *publica carmina* refers to the *Fasti*.

manage this transition so successfully because the form of government he established at the outset maintained much of the old in the Roman political tradition, even as it introduced something completely new. Similarly, Ovid's *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* draw readily upon the rich literary history of Greece and Rome that proceeds them, even as they introduce a subject that is entirely new to Latin poetry: the first-hand documentation of an exiled poet that makes the personal experience of an individual on the outer reaches of the empire knowable to all in the city.[28] In both cases there is an evident disjunction between surface and subtext: in Ovid, the private letter amounts to a public lament; in the case of Augustus, the re-founded republic is in fact a hereditary monarchy.

The end of Augustus' reign and the years of Ovid's exile (8–c. 17 AD) have been the subject of extensive study, though the historical sources for the period remain notably scarce.[29] Amid the dearth, Ovid's exilic poems furnish welcome names and dates and otherwise unattested documentation, for example, of religious rites and legal practices that become common later.[30] More generally, they bear witness to the end of the transition from republic to principate and look ahead to the imperial rule to come.[31] A characteristic feature of the early principate has been identified by scholars of Roman religion, law, and art as the increasingly visible presence of the *princeps* in nearly every facet of the Roman state.[32] Almost unavoidably, the increasing visibility of the emperor, or rather the increased amount of space Augustus and his family appear to occupy in virtually all forms of imperial discourse, comes at a price: other, perhaps divergent ways of expressing what it means to be Roman—including, for example, Ovid's eroto-didactic

---

[28] Stroh 1981, 2638–2639, and 2645: "doch sind Ovids Verbannungselegien … ein völliges Novum in der Literaturgeschichte, ein Novum darin, daß in ihnen eine neue Weise dichterischer Selbstinterpretation entdeckt und in die europäische Literatur eingeführt worden ist. Ich meine: die Vorstellung eines Dichtens, das nur auf den Dichter selbst gerichtet ist; Dichtung als Selbsttröstung und Selbstbefreiung."

[29] Syme 1978, 168.

[30] On worship in the imperial cult, *Pont.* 4.9.105–118 and below 98–107; on new juridical procedure, see *Tr.* 2.131–138 and below 38. Critics have often remarked on the very historical character of these poems, and it is no coincidence that Syme focuses on the exilic corpus in *History in Ovid*, e.g. 82: "…Ovid now acquires unexpected value. The events [of military maneuvers recorded in *Pont.* 4.7 and 9] are nowhere else on even the faintest record."

[31] Hardie 2002c, 35 and n. 5 and 45.

[32] E.g. Latte 1960, 305; Jolowicz and Nicholas 1972, 325; Wallace-Hadrill 1987, 226.

voice in the *Ars*—will eventually lose their place in Rome. In the most basic metaphorical terms, the non-Augustan will inevitably be pushed out of the city, figuratively marginalized from the center of imperial discourse, and compelled to seek refuge in another, perhaps non-Roman space. Of course, the irony in Ovid's case is that a potential metaphor became a hard reality, and in 8 AD the poet was legally banned from the city the *princeps* controlled; he was forced, he says, to suffer in exile on the outermost edge of the newly reshaped Roman empire. There, he wrote poems that continue even now to provide poignant commentary on some of the changes Augustus introduced to Rome and the running of its empire. As we shall see in chapters 2–5 below, the fundamentally unflattering observations on the Augustan innovations to the practice of Roman religion and law that permeate Ovid's exile poetry are as new to Latin poetry as *Caesaris imperium* or "Caesar's rule" is new to Roman history.

Myth and History

It is common in classical scholarship to note that poetic convention among the ancient Greeks and Romans—as among contemporary writers—generally presupposes a separation between what is represented in verse and what is actually experienced in life. The conventional separation between poetry and life, or rather between artistic representation and lived experience, also lies at the heart of the problem of documenting history in poetry. I touched briefly on this problem above in relation to Ovid's representation of the physical reality of his place of exile (18–19), but it also deserves to be considered from the opposite perspective in relation to the claims the poet makes regarding the power of poetry and its creative capacity. We are offered an ideal occasion for doing so on the basis of a frequently cited verse from the final book of the *Epistulae ex Ponto*, 4.8.55: *di quoque carminibus, si fas est dicere, fiunt* "gods too, if it is right to say, are created by poetry." The immediate context of the verse shows that it belongs to an extended mythological catalogue of a familiar type in Ovid's poetry of exile,[33] in which the poet reflects on the relationship of poetry to received notions of divinity, *Pont.* 4.8.55–64:

[33] Cf. Bernhardt 1986, 269–272.

di quoque carminibus, si fas est dicere, fiunt,
tantaque maiestas ore canentis eget.
sic Chaos ex illa naturae mole prioris
digestum partes scimus habere suas;
sic adfectantes caelestia regna Gigantes
ad Styga nimbifero uindicis igne datos;
sic uictor laudem superatis Liber ab Indis,
Alcides capta traxit ab Oechalia,
et modo, Caesar, auum, quem uirtus addidit astris,
sacrarunt aliqua carmina parte tuum.

> Gods too, if it is right to say, are created by poetry, and such magisterial greatness needs the voice of a poet. Via verse we know that Chaos was separated from that mass of its former nature and now has distinct divisions; that the Giants, because they aspired to the rule of heaven, were consigned to the Styx by the lightning of the avenger; that Liber won praise from his defeat of the Indians, Hercules from having captured Oechalia; and that recently, Caesar, your grandfather, whom virtue put in heaven, was made an object of worship in part by poetry.

The "Caesar" addressed here is Germanicus, heir designate to the new emperor Tiberius and a fellow poet to boot. To him Ovid offers a learned discourse on the role of poetry in recording tales of mythical figures who, like Bacchus and Hercules, have acquired celestial divinity or, as in the case of the Giants, have been denied access to heaven. The final distich moves from the world of myth and its representation in literature to recent imperial history and the state-sanctioned deification of Rome's first emperor Augustus in 14 AD.

The poet assumes the role of didact here to teach Germanicus something that as the emperor-in-waiting he no doubt already knows: that poetry had always held a position of importance in transmitting knowledge of divine succession and had also played a part in making his adoptive grandfather an object of religious worship (*sacrarunt*).[34] Ovid is alluding to the poetry he claims elsewhere in this book to have written on the apotheosis of Augustus.[35] As a *uates* himself (v. 67, *Fasti* 1.25), Germanicus can appreciate Ovid's lesson on the power of

[34] Cf. *OLD* s.v. §4b, and Lieberg 1985, 31 n. 12.

[35] *Pont.* 4.6.17–18: *quale tamen potui, de caelite, Brute, recenti / uestra procul positus carmen in ora dedi* "Though in exile far away, Brutus, I have nevertheless offered for your reading the kind of poem I could write about the newly made god;" 4.9.131–132: *perueniant istuc et carmina forsitan illa, / quae de te misi caelite facta nouo* "Perhaps those poems I sent on about your recent apotheosis may even make it there;" 4.13.23–24; and see Helzle 1989, 147, ad *Pont.* 4.6.17: "this phrase recalls the deification of Julius Caesar at *Met.* XV 843 ff., esp. 846: *recentem animam caelestibus intulit astris* (a soul introduced anew to the heavenly stars)." (translation mine).

poetry to immortalize its subject.[36] As the second most important man in the Roman empire, he is also in a position to do something about the poet's exile.[37] Of course, herein lies the alleged reason Ovid continues to compose poetry: he appeals to contacts of influence at Rome to obtain a reprieve or at least a commutation of punishment to a place more amenable than Tomis where he claims to suffer amid perpetual snows and savage inhabitants.[38] As such these poems fall under the more general rubric of Roman elegy as *werbende Dichtung*.[39]

This mytho-historical catalogue, however, needs also to be read in relation to the legal action of the Roman senate that made Julius Caesar a god and imparted a divine status to the emperor Augustus to be conferred officially upon his death.[40] Though exiled and physically lost to his former life at Rome, Ovid is reclaiming for Roman poets as sacred *uates* a stake in determining how gods maintain an essential

---

[36] Cf. *Pont.* 4.8.43–54: *nec tamen officio uatum per carmina facto / principibus res est aptior ulla uiris. / carmina uestrarum peragunt praeconia laudum, / neue sit actorum fama caduca, cauent. / carmine fit uiuax uirtus, expersque sepulcri / notitiam serae posteritatis habet. / tabida consumit ferrum lapidemque uetustas, / nullaque res maius tempore robur habet. / scripta ferunt annos: scriptis Agamemnona nosti, / et quisquis contra uel simul arma tulit. / quis Thebas septemque duces sine carmine nosset, / et quidquid post haec, quidquid et ante, fuit?* "And yet for leaders of men there is nothing more apt than the service of poets realized in song. Poems make public your praises and see to it that the glory of your deeds does not fall. Virtue comes alive via verse, and eschewing burial it receives the notice of posterity to come. Corrosive old age eats away at stone and iron, and nothing has greater strength than the course of time. What's written lasts for years: through writing you know of Agamemnon and whoever bore arms with or against him. Who would know of Thebes and her seven leaders and what happened before and after that without verse?" Cf. Stroh 1971, 235–249, on the *Verewigungstopik* in Greek and Latin poetry; Rosati 1979, 125–127, on Ovidian innovation with that theme.

[37] Cf. Knox 2001, 179; Herbert-Brown 1994, 175–185.

[38] *Pont.* 4.8.81–88: *prosit opemque ferat communia sacra tueri / atque isdem studiis imposuisse manum: / litora pellitis nimium subiecta Corallis / ut tandem saeuos effugiamque Getas, / clausaque si misero patria est, ut ponar in ullo, / qui minus Ausonia distet ab Vrbe loco* "May I benefit and get help from keeping rites in common and from having both tried our hands at the same pursuit: may I at last escape shores far too close to the hide-clad Coralli and the savage Getans and, if my homeland's closed off to me in my wretchedness, may I be put some place less distant from Ausonian Rome;" cf. *Pont.* 1.3.49–50: *orbis in extremi iaceo desertus harenis, / fert ubi perpetuas obruta terra niues* "I lie abandoned on the sands at the end of the earth, where the land lies buried under constant snow."

[39] Stroh 1971, 250–253. Note, however, with Claassen 1987, 39–40, that Ovid may never truly have hoped for a reprieve and that, if these poems are indeed *werbend*, their reputed aim may still escape us; cf. Heckel 2003, 93; and below 156 with n. 74.

[40] On Caesar, see Gradel 2002, 55–56, 69–71, who also shows (e.g. 73–103, 263–264) that Augustus was in fact honored as a god in his lifetime, just *never* as a publicly state-sanctioned deity within the city of Rome.

feature of their divinity: immortality.[41] The poet appears to be challenging here the suggestive power of legal decrees, such as those that led to Caesar's cult name *diuus Iulius* and Augustus' title *pater patriae* (see below, 73) and thus conferred a divine status on the emperor and his family and, ultimately, made them into objects of worship throughout the empire. In fact, as I shall show later in this study (Chs. 3 & 6), Ovid undercuts the move—be it legal, poetic, or part of ritual practice—to turn men into gods by showing his readers the kind of vengeful gods the Caesars could become. Ultimately, he must have known well that his words would be ignored and that in the immediate sequence of events the voice of single poet—exiled, aging, and forlorn—was indeed powerless. Nevertheless, his mode of negotiating his relationship with the emperor masks a latent resistance and resolute antagonism that otherwise remain hidden beneath the surface obsequiousness of Ovid's exilic *persona*. By adopting an unfailingly acquiescent rhetorical stance throughout his poems from exile—there is no open opposition—the poet becomes in verse what the emperor has forced him to become in life, and the surface level of the poems aptly reflects the poet's very real misery in exile.

For ancient poets like Ovid, however, the immediate sequence of contemporary events was (or was professed to be) of less consequence than poetic immortality and an active readership in posterity. The idea of a literary fame transcending time had of course always been important for Ovid from the beginning of his career.[42] It has been argued that Ovid goes further than his Augustan predecessors Vergil and Horace, who linked their own eternal glory to the survival of Rome, in declaring his own verse to be the guarantor of his immortality.[43] It will not be surprising then that in the opening distich of his autobiography in verse, *Tristia* 4.10, a poem unlike any other in the literary tradition of ancient Greece and Rome, Ovid appeals directly to future readers:

---

[41] See Feeney 1998, 114; ib. 1991, 210–212, on the apotheosis of Caesar in *Met.* 15, esp. 211: "Caesar is a god because his adopted son made him one." Note, however, Gradel 2002, 32: "One might ... think that immortality was generally taken to be a *sine qua non* for divine status. That was not so."

[42] E.g. *Am.* 1.15.7–8, 41–42, cf. McKeown 1989, 387–389 and ad loc.

[43] Rosati 1979, 120. The difference between the national poets Vergil and Horace on the one hand and the exiled Ovid on the other is related to a distinction between nationalism and exile made by Edward Said in his influential "Reflections on Exile," Said 2000, 176: "Nationalism is an assertion of belonging in and to a place, a people, a heritage ... it fends off exile, fights to prevent its ravages."

accipe posteritas "listen, posterity."[44] The effectiveness of this appeal depends again on the power of poetry to endure time, hardly a sure prospect for any poet, let alone one marginalized under extreme physical conditions on the outer reaches of the Roman empire. Ovid responds to his exile by creating a lasting "counter-reality" to the bitter reality of an historical situation in which power has come to rest in the hands of a single individual and poetry has been forced out of the city to the margins of empire.[45]

The power of poetry to recreate a reality distinct from contemporary circumstances is an important theme in these poems and one that informs the catalogue with which we started above: *di quoque carminibus, si fas est dicere, fiunt.* Godo Lieberg has noted that the religious formula *si fas est dicere* indicates "that [Ovid's] statement is very audacious, perhaps even contrary to the dictates of religion."[46] He calls this verse an instance of "rhetorical hyperbole," which is immediately qualified in the couplet's pentameter, 56: *tantaque maiestas ore canentis eget* "and such magisterial greatness needs the voice of a poet."[47] Lieberg points to the word *maiestas* as a distinguishing feature of divinity in antiquity and argues that ancient poetry normally enhances divine majesty by honoring it in verse, as for example Ovid's own verses on the apotheosis of Augustus at 63–64:

> et modo, Caesar, auum, quem uirtus addidit astris,
> sacrarunt aliqua carmina parte tuum.

> And recently, Caesar, your grandfather, whom virtue put in heaven, was made an object of worship in part by poetry.

For Lieberg, Ovid locates the power of the poet here not in creating gods or making new myths but in "preserving mythical events in the memory of mankind."[48] He is justifiably cautious about overinterpreting

---

[44] Pfeiffer 1976, 10–11, recognized Ovid's autobiographical poem as the source for Petrarch's *Posteritati* "To Posterity." Like Ovid, Petrarch found himself between two epochs in history and, in the words of Pfeiffer, "stood in the centre as the dominating figure between past and future."

[45] Heaney 1995, 3–4: "[In] the activity of poetry … there is a tendency to place a counter-reality in the scales—a reality which may be only imagined but which nevertheless has weight because it is imagined with the gravitational pull of the actual and can therefore hold its own and balance out against the historical situation."

[46] Lieberg 1985, 28.

[47] Lieberg 1985, 28–29: "The poet in his desire to exalt the power of poetry transgresses the limits of credibility."

[48] Lieberg 1985, 29. Cf. Newman 2006, 319 and passim.

a single hexameter in isolation and burdening the poet with the construction of a mythical corpus all his own. Instead, he prefers to see Ovid working within the ancient tradition of mimetic literature with the gods and heroes familiar from Homer, Hesiod, and the corpus of Greek myth.

Gianpiero Rosati has argued, however, that Ovid's statement is in fact in line with an ambitious poetic program initiated at the beginning of his career that insists on the creative power of poetry: the poet's gods become "real" by virtue of existing within a given poem.[49] Rosati's arguments belong to a larger study of an *esistenza letteraria*, that is, a purely literary existence that need only be reified by the poetic act.[50] He advances the theory that Ovidian poetics breaks from the ancient tradition of mimetic representation in ascribing a reality to poetic creation that can stand on its own. His arguments have received some critical support, especially in defining the poetics of the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* as essentially creative and not merely mimetic.[51] For my own argument, Rosati's conclusion fundamentally challenges Lieberg's notion of "rhetorical hyperbole" and suggests a reading of the above passage according to which Ovid acknowledges the mimetic tradition even as he claims to create in verse actual gods whose existence depends on the power of poetry to sustain an alternative reality to the reality of historical events.[52] For Rosati, history and poetry are complementary, not mutually exclusive; they both contribute to the re-creation of reality with neither having a privileged claim to truth.

Rosati's reading here relates to Heaney's idea of "the redressing effect of poetry" invoked at the outset to this study, whereby the poetic act has the capacity to provide a counterweight to the burden of political persecution. This counterweight may be the purely imagined

---

[49] Rosati 1979, 125–127.

[50] Rosati 1983 expands the arguments of this article. See also Horsfall 1993 with bibliography on the related problem of Vergilian and Ovidian inventions of myth.

[51] Claassen 2001, 12; Viarre 1991, 117: "Les *Tristes* et les *Pontiques* constituent une réalité littéraire, ou plus exactement poétique;" ib. 1988; cf. Solodow 1988, 213, for whom "art is not the imitator but the definer and creator of reality" in *Met.*

[52] Rosati 1979, 126: "[l]a poesia non solo è testimone insostituibile degli eventi storici, ma si sostuisce, supplisce alla realtà e alla storia dove questo non 'fanno testo', dove hanno le loro lacune … Ovidio attribuisce alla poesia il merito di aver surrogato la realtà, di averne 'fatto' dei settori." Cf. Miller 2004, 234: "To the extent that this separate realm becomes an autonomous cultivated sphere of scripted reflection, then the subject who imaginatively invested in that realm must die to the world of declarative public meaning and recognized 'facts'."

reality of literary creation, but it is nevertheless real.[53] Of course, Ovid's counterweighting depends on the enduring quality of myth and on his own ability to weave the personal experience of exile into the literary tapestry that includes the universal tales of the Greco-Roman mythical corpus. By limiting Ovid's understanding of the poet's task here to preserving myth for memory's sake, Professor Lieberg risks neglecting how myth and history form an inextricable nexus in Ovid's exile poetry.[54]

As in the *Metamorphoses*, where a mytho-historical continuum runs from the beginning of creation up to the poet's own time (1.3–4: *ab origine mundi* ... *ad mea* ... *tempora*), so too in the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* does Ovid run the events of a mythical past up to the recent events of Roman history. In fact, in the catalogue under discussion from *Pont.* 4.8, the poet recapitulates *en miniature* the myths of divine succession from Chaos to the establishment of the Olympian order and the defeat of the Giants to which he gave such prominent treatment at the opening of the *Metamorphoses* (1.5–162). At the end of that poem, Ovid links the machinations of Olympian Jupiter and Venus to the state-sanctioned apotheosis of Julius Caesar (*Met.* 15.799–851). In the catalogue under discussion from the last book of the *Epistulae ex Ponto*, the list of divinized figures from myth culminates in the formal deification of the emperor Augustus (63–64).[55] In short, if Ovid is preserving myth here as Professor Lieberg suggests, he is also documenting history.

History was of course clearly distinguished from poetry in the Greco-Roman literary tradition, and each discipline often defined itself against the other as what it was not: poetry was poetry by virtue of not being

---

[53] Cf. Kennedy 2002, 327, on the "magically realized" account of Ovid's exile in Christoph Ransmayr's *The Last World* (Germ. orig. 1988): "The most fantastic things have actually been believed or asserted [about Ovid] by live people somewhere ... This doesn't make these things true, but it may make them real. On the other hand, those interpretations of the past which seem to be most 'real' to us are not thereby to be taken uncritically as 'true'."

[54] It deserves note here that in *Poeta Creator* 1982, to which his 1985 article "*Poeta creator*: Some religious aspects" is an addendum, Lieberg had already suggested (111) that Ovid was familiar with the idea of poetry as "ein schöpferischer Akt," i.e. an idea perhaps contrary to the prevailing opinion of antiquity (2) but nevertheless something more than mere preservation. Cf. Lieberg 1982, 172: "Platon allerdings sieht im ποιητής auch das schöpferische Moment, wenn er ihn im *Phaidon* als Erfinder von Mythen definiert, d.h. von fiktiven Erzählungen. Diese Linie führt dann, bewußt oder unbewußt, Ovid weiter, indem er die *fecunda licentia vatum* in der Schaffung der Mythologie betont."

[55] Cf. Gradel 2002, 261–304, on what such state-sanctioned deification involved.

history and *vice versa*.[56] For Ovid, the way in which the one differs from the other is a matter of artistic self-definition, and he defines his own task as poet in relation to the task of historian in *Amores* 3.12.41–42:

> exit in immensum fecunda licentia uatum
> obligat historica nec sua uerba fide.

> The imaginative freedom of bards goes beyond measure and does not fetter its words with the credit of history.[57]

According to Ovid, poetry differs from history because it is fictive, and the poetic endeavor is exemplified at its most productive stage by the imaginative freedom of the *uates*. The figure of the *uates* plays a vital role in the exile poetry in determining the position of the poet in Augustan Rome. In the broader debate between poetry and history the *uates* is a "seer" with access to special knowledge, in particular knowledge of future events.[58] In Hesiod (*Theog.* 38), for example, this is true of every poet who channels the Muses' knowledge of the past, present, and future. Indeed, the predominant view in antiquity holds that where poetry also looks forward, history only looks back in recording detail to draw a veristic picture of the past. Historical verism was never a criterion for Greek and Latin verse, and Cicero says of those looking for it in poetry, *Leg.* 1.1.4: *faciunt imperite* "they act in ignorance."[59] For Cicero, there are different rules to be observed in the writing (and reading) of history and poetry: the one aims entirely at truth; the other mostly at pleasure.[60]

---

[56] Cic. *Leg.* 1.1.1–5, on which see below n. 60.

[57] This passage is central to arguments of Rosati 1979, e.g. 102 with n. 2 and 110, and is also discussed by Lieberg 1985, 26–27; *ib.* 1982, 107–111; cf. Hardie 2002a, 6 with n. 16.

[58] Plaut. *Mil.* 911: *bonus uatis poteras esse, nam quae sunt futura dicis* "You could have been a good seer, for what you say will come true;" and *Met.* 15.878–879: *ore legar populi perque omnia saecula fama / siquid habent ueri uatum praesagia uiuam* "My words will be in people's mouths and, if the prophecies of bards have any truth to them, my fame will live through every age."

[59] Claassen 1988, esp. 158–159, offers an excellent critique of "historicist" readings of the exile poetry, citing the seminal article of Allen 1950, who applied the critique more broadly to those looking for "sincerity" in the Roman elegists and ancient poetry in general.

[60] *Leg.* 1.1.5: [Quint.] *Intellego te, frater, alias in historia leges obseruandas putare, alias in poemate.* [Marc.] *Quippe cum in illa ad ueritatem ⟨omnia⟩, Quinte, referantur, in hoc ad delectationem pleraque; quamquam et apud Herodotum, patrem historiae, et apud Theopompum sunt innumerabiles fabulae.* "Quintus: 'I see, my brother, that you think that different rules ought to be observed in history and in poetry.' Marcus: 'Indeed, Quintus, since everything in history is told for the sake of truth whereas in poetry most things are told for the sake of

The pleasing quality of poetry was, of course, a matter of aesthetic principle for Greek and Latin poets, most memorably formulated by Horace in the *Ars Poetica*.[61] There Horace asserts that the most successful poet unites in verse what is at once pleasing (*delectare / dulce*) and useful (*prodesse / utile*). In his open appeal to Augustus from *Tristia* 2—a literary defense of his poetic career and of the art of poetry itself—Ovid acknowledges the pleasing quality of literature, especially the works of poets other than himself.[62] Towards the usefulness of his own poetry, however, he has an ambivalent attitude: on the one hand, it is (partly) responsible for his downfall; on the other, it is the means to his salvation.[63] In this regard he is like Telephus, exiled at birth and later ruler of Mysia, whose wound from Achilles had to be healed by the same spear that dealt it, *Tr.* 2.19–22:

pleasure. At the same time, there are innumerable made-up stories in both Herodotus, the father of history, and Theopompus'." See Dyck 2004, ad 1.1.5a: "the difference between poetry and history is implicit at Thuc. 1.21.1 … and 22.4 …, insofar as what is lacking in his history (τὸ μυθῶδες and the quality of being pleasing to the hearing) is associated with poetry." As an abstract formulation of this difference Dyck cites a familiar passage from Aristotle's *Poetics* (1451b4–15.) which states that history is concerned with what happened, poetry with what might probably or necessarily have happened; the historian deals only with the actual, while the poet aims at the universal with which the actual coexists. Aristotle's main concern here is with plot (μῦθος), with a story-line fit for poetic representation on the stage. Though not theatrical in this sense, Ovid's poetry of exile nevertheless contains the dramatic core of a story about exile that runs from his banishment from Rome in *Tristia* 1 to, say, the Getic poem he mentions having composed on the deification of Augustus in his posthumous book of letters from the Black Sea (*Pont.* 4.13). Over the course of this story, the personal or what Ovid represents himself as having actually experienced becomes what necessarily had to happen to a poet of his kind in the latter period of the Augustan principate.

[61] Hor. *Ars* 333–344.: *aut prodesse uolunt aut delectare poetae / aut simul et iucunda et idonea dicere uitae / … / ficta uoluptatis causa sint proxima ueris / ne quodcumque uelit poscat sibi fabula credi / … / omne tulit punctum qui miscuit utile dulci, / lectorem delectando pariterque monendo* "Poets wish either to be useful or to delight or to say things at once pleasing and useful to life …for the sake of pleasure things made up ought to approximate the truth lest your play demand credence for whatever it wants … he has won every vote who has mixed the useful with the pleasant, delighting and instructing his reader in equal measure." See Brink 1971, ad 338–342.

[62] Cf. *Tr.* 2.357–358: *nec liber indicium est animi, sed honesta uoluptas, / plurima mulcendis auribus apta feret* "Nor is a book representative of character, but an upstanding pleasure that will offer much that is likely to soothe the ears." On *Tr.* 2 as a literary *apologia* for Ovid's work as a poet, cf. Barchiesi 1997, 29–30; Williams 1994, 200; Nugent 1990; Luck 1977, 93.

[63] Ovid's inner monologue at the outset of the poem captures the essence of this Catch-22, *Tr.* 2.1–14: *Quid mihi uobiscum est, infelix cura, libelli, / ingenio perii qui miser ipse meo?…* "Why, my books, do I bother with you, my unlucky concern, when I've come to wretched ruin by my own talent? …" This problem becomes a major theme of

forsitan, ut quondam Teuthrantia regna tenenti,
sic mihi res eadem uulnus opemque feret,
Musaque, quam mouit, motam quoque leniet iram;
exorant magnos carmina saepe deos.

Perhaps, as once for him who ruled the kingdom of Teuthras, what brought my wound will heal it, and the Muse who provoked the wrath will soften it too; poetry often prevails upon the great gods.

Of course, Augustus is the divine dealer of Ovid's woe—and one of his "great gods" in the final verse here—and poetry has the potential to be useful insofar as it can help the poet in prevailing upon the *princeps* to recall him from Tomis.[64] In his direct appeal to Augustus, Ovid relies on poetry to exonerate himself from the blame attached to his verse—his didactic poem on the art of love, one of the alleged causes of his banishment—emphasizing the gap between his art and his life, *Tr.* 2.353–356:

crede mihi, distant mores a carmine nostri:
uita uerecunda est, Musa iocosa mihi;
magnaque pars operum mendax et ficta meorum
plus sibi permisit compositore suo.

Believe me, my character differs from my poetry: my life is modest; my Muse playful. Most of my work is untrue and made up and has allowed itself more than its author is wont to do.

The inherent fictionality of poetry that Ovid summons to his defense here and had already associated with the figure of the *uates* from the *Amores* passage quoted above is tied to the fictionality of myth. As in myth—and the symbolic significance of the figure of Telephus, former

---

the exile poetry, e.g. *Tr.* 4.1.35–40: *nos quoque delectant, quamuis nocuere, libelli, / quodque mihi telum uulnera fecit, amo. / forsitan hoc studium possit furor esse uideri, / sed quiddam furor hic utilitatis. / semper in obtutu mentem uetat esse malorum, / praesentis casus inmemoremque facit* "I still love books, though they've brought me harm, and I adore the weapon that has inflicted my wounds. Perhaps this pursuit may look like madness, but there is something of use in this madness: it forbids the mind to obsess constantly over my ills and makes it forgetful of its current misfortune;" *Pont.* 3.9.55–56: *da ueniam scriptis, quorum non gloria nobis / causa, sed utilitas officiumque fuit* "excuse what I've written, which I did not for glory but because I had to for expediency;" 4.2.29–32, 39–40; 4.13.41–42: *carmina nil prosunt: nocuerunt carmina quondam, / primaque tam miserae causa fuere fugae* "Poetry is of no use: poetry once brought me harm and thus became the primary reason for my wretched exile." Claassen 1989b provides a customarily insightful analysis of this theme.

[64] Cf. Nagle 1980, 71–82, on the two senses of *utilitas* in the exile poetry: to bring about a recall from exile and to stave off loneliness and death.

exile and famous wretch, in the same poem is a case in point—the fictive quality of poetry need not impugn the veracity of the poetic endeavor.

In an influential article on the veracity of myth in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, Fritz Graf (1988) has referred to the inherent "paradox of myth," namely that it is clearly not true but also not necessarily false. According to Graf, Ovid exploits this paradox in the *Metamorphoses* in attempting to comprehend the limits of human experience.[65] His analysis of myth in Ovid's *magnum opus* also applies to the poet's use of mythical *exempla* to reconstruct the story of his personal experience in exile.[66] For the Greeks and Romans, the mythical stories of poetry never had to have happened in order to serve as a tool for interpreting the events of history. No other poem in Latin literature is more concerned with adapting the Greco-Roman mythic tradition to the historical reality at Rome than the *Aeneid*. There Vergil refers to Augustus' refounding of the republic by analogy to Aeneas' founding of Rome. Myth allows the poet to remove the story of actual events from an historical to a poetic level where readers can accept its patent fictionality without detriment to its interpretive significance.[67] In the *Aeneid* Vergil maintains a calculated distance from the events themselves and allows meaning to hover in the gap between myth and history. He shows Ovid how myth becomes a point of reference for historical changes taking place in Augustan Rome.[68] In the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* Ovid follows the example of Vergil, perhaps with the same degree of immediacy that he did in the *Metamorphoses*. Now, however, myth not only applies to the wide range of political, legal, and cultural changes introduced by

[65] Graf 1988, 57–60.

[66] See Graf 2002, 114–115 (following Rahn 1958, 117): "[in the exile poetry] reality exceeds by far the limits of what the mythic template can perform ... [but] even though it breaks down as a paradigm, the mythic tradition still functions as a gauge; by its very breaking down, it signals the new and unheard-of suffering of the exile ... Ovid's exile signals the end of mythology's usefulness." Bernhardt 1986, 8–13, provides a concise summary of the paradigmatic function of myth (and history) in Greco-Roman literature out of its origins in rhetorical training. On the exemplarity of myth in the exile poetry specifically, see Claassen 2001, 32–34, and ib. 1988; Ehlers 1988, 156; Nisbet 1982, 51–54 (on *Tr.* 4.3); Döpp 1968, 142 with n. 3; for a contrary view, see Davisson 1993, 224–237.

[67] Graf 1988, 68: "Personne n'avait de doute à l'égard du caractère fictionnel de l'Énéide ... mais la "fictionalité" n'a pas causé un préjudice à la pertinence explicative du poème."

[68] Graf 1988, 57, and 68; ib. 1994, 42.

Augustus at Rome, it also embraces the personal experiences the poet claims himself to have lived.[69]

In the exile poetry Ovid exploits myth to interpret his present circumstance and, ultimately, to construct a poetic reality with which to comprehend the external reality surrounding him. That reality must have come as a shock to his system, as he tells us himself: *Tr.* 1.1.81–82:

> me quoque, quae sensi, fateor Iouis arma timere:
> me reor infesto, cum tonat, igne peti.
>
> I admit that I'm also afraid of Jupiter's arms, which I've actually felt: when it thunders, I feel as if I'm being attacked by enemy fire.

Ovid relates his experience in mythical terms, displacing his pain from an actual to a mythical level thereby enlarging and intensifying the severity of his exile for his readers. Indeed, throughout the exilic corpus Ovid likens himself to Actaeon, Telephus and other well-known figures from Greco-Roman myth who often in spite of their innocence suffered severe punishment at the hands of vengeful gods or demi-gods. The legitimacy of Ovid's punishment and the nature of the (quasi-divine) dealer of his sentence of exile will be the subject of the next chapter.

[69] Cf. Martindale 1988, 15: "[Ovidian] literariness can be prettily illustrated from Tristia I, a book of poems which more clearly than almost anything else in ancient literature has a definite autobiographical basis, yet paradoxically has equally an overwhelmingly literary flavour. It is thus significant that the autonomy of poetry, which in Ovid's case allows his art to survive the disaster of his life, is one of the main themes of the exile poetry ... Throughout [Book I] the Emperor is treated as a typical Ovidian god in his arbitrary sway. Life has become subsumed into art."

CHAPTER TWO

CRIMES AND PUNISHMENTS: THE LEGITIMACY OF OVID'S BANISHMENT

> *maxima poena mihi est ipsum offendisse*
>
> "The greatest punishment for me is to have offended him."
>
> *Tr.* 5.11.11

In his poems from exile Ovid shows an intense interest in the legitimacy of his own actions vis-à-vis those of the Roman *princeps*. He often defines the nature of his crime over against the severe and public punishment it received. In doing so, he uses specific terms of the law for offenses which by accepted standards of interpretation of the Roman legal code would not seem to merit exile. By inference he shows that his predicament is peculiar, if not unique, *Tr.* 2.131–138:

> nec mea decreto damnasti facta senatus,
> nec mea selecto iudice iussa fuga est:
> tristibus inuectus uerbis—ita principe dignum—
> ultus es offensas, ut decet, ipse tuas.
> adde quod edictum, quamuis immite minaxque,
> attamen in poenae nomine lene fuit:
> quippe relegatus, non exul, dicor in illo,
> priuaque fortunae sunt ibi uerba meae.

> You did not condemn my deeds by senatorial decree, nor was my exile ordered after a judge was chosen: with stern words—as is worthy of a prince—you inveighed and, as is fitting, by yourself avenged offenses against you. Add that, though harsh and threatening, the edict that came was still mild on the matter of the punishment's name: indeed, in it I'm said to be "relegated," not "exiled," and the words there are particular to what has befallen me.

On the basis of this passage scholars have deduced either that there was a trial before the senate[1] or that Ovid met with Augustus privately *in*

[1] Jones 1960, 88, calls this a senatorial trial on the grounds that no judge was selected (132) and therefore a *iudicium publicum* (public trial) could not have taken place. Suet. *Aug.* 33.1–3; 51.2 and Dio 56.26.1 show Augustus involved in trials as judge, but

camera.[2] But the poet never mentions a trial, and though it appears—to this reader at least—highly unlikely that there was one, it is impossible to know for sure.[3] Nevertheless, the evidence from the poems strongly suggests that the *princeps* did not follow republican juridical procedure but acted himself as *iudex* in deciding on the poet's punishment.[4] Indeed, it is very likely that Ovid's contemporaries at Rome recognized that the poet's representation of the legal proceedings revealed a significant breach in established practice. Of course, implicit herein is that this same representation contained the basis of a veiled attack on the *princeps* for what amounted to an unprecedented usurpation of the powers of the Roman courts.

Again, as far as we can determine from the poems themselves, the poet and the *princeps* never appeared in those courts together and there was no public trial (surely Ovid would not have missed the opportunity to show himself and Augustus engaged in debate!). It looks rather as if the sentence was pronounced from the Palatine and delivered in an edict to Ovid, as he tells us later in the *Epistulae ex Ponto*, while he was on the island of Elba visiting perhaps his closest friend, Cotta Maximus.[5] Regarding the edict itself, the poet relates that the formal charges against him were two in number, *Tr.* 2.207: *duo crimina, carmen et errror* "charges for two crimes, a poem and a mistake."[6] He tells us that the *carmen* was the *Ars Amatoria*, which was banned because it was deemed obscene, not criminal (*Tr.* 2.211–212, 240). Though Ovid intimates that the *princeps* was involved in or at least affected by the *error*, he declines

---

evidence for the private trial in the palace or villa of the *princeps* only exists for his successors, e.g. Tiberius (Tac. *Ann.* 3.10), Claudius (Tac. *Ann.* 11.2), Trajan (Plin. *Ep.* 6.31). Mommsen 1955, 260–266, posits that all criminal proceedings conducted by the emperor as revealed by later sources were established by Augustus, a view accepted by Millar 1977, 523–524, but challenged by Kelly 1957, 37–46, and Bleicken 1962, 66–78.

[2] So Goold 1983, 99; see Owen 1924, 42: "This process required no formal act of accusation, and could be instituted in virtue of information which the emperor himself possessed, or which was supplied to him by an informer ... being without publicity and without appeal these trials became one of the chief engines of imperial tyranny."

[3] Cf. Grasmück 1978, 136, who posits that there was no trial and that Augustus committed "einen Akt uneingeschränkter koerzitiver Gewalt," invested in him by the power of *imperium proconsulare maius* (greater proconsular power), cf. ib. 128 with n. 463.

[4] *Tr.* 1.2.64: *culpa mea est ipso iudice* [sc. Caesare] *morte minor* "My fault is unworthy of death in the eyes of Caesar himself, who acted as judge."

[5] *Pont.* 2.3.84, and see Helzle 2003, 157; Syme 1978, 117–118, 125–130.

[6] As often throughout his poems from exile, Ovid is playing here upon the two most prominent meanings of *crimen*—charge and crime—which this translation attempts to capture.

to reveal its exact nature.[7] In fact, the poet never allows us to form a clear picture of what precisely transpired before he went into exile. Instead, we are left with the impression that whatever happened was a personal matter between Ovid and Augustus.[8] The latter then took it upon himself to punish Ovid (*ultus es … ipse*) in a highly public fashion (*edictum*) under unusual circumstances that were particular to the poet's predicament (*priuaque fortunae … uerba meae*).

The curious circumstances of Ovid's banishment and his nebulous legal status in exile are wrapped up in the peculiarity of these poems. Exile had always been a political reality in the ancient world and, at least since the Greek lyric poet Alcaeus in the late sixth century BC, had also been the subject of poetry.[9] Never, however, had a poet's lived experience in exile been the sole concern over so many books in antiquity. Even when the poet varies his subject—the causes of exile, its hardships, and the lament it occasions—he still frames his experience in terms of his relationship to the emperor.[10] It follows from this that he sets up the issue of the legality of his banishment as a personal matter between himself as defendant (*reus*) and Augustus as judge (*iudex*).[11] This in turn corresponds to a larger historical development that takes place during the Augustan period of the principate whereby the status of the *princeps* as a private citizen in Rome begins to fade behind

---

[7] *Tr.* 2.208–209: *alterius facti culpa silenda mihi; / nam non sum tanti, renouem ut tua uulnera, Caesar* "I must keep silent the fault of the latter deed, for I am not worth so much, Caesar, that I may reopen the wounds I caused you."

[8] Cf. Claassen 1987, 33–34; Little 1982, 344.

[9] Grasmück 1978, 15–29, for the legal roots of exile in the Greek world, esp. 21–22 on Alcaeus. More recently, Gaertner's edited volume, *Writing Exile: The Discourse of Displacement in Greco-Roman Antiquity and Beyond* (2007), seeks to go beyond the *trias exulum*—Cicero, Ovid, Seneca—by offering several excellent studies of the literary treatment of exile from archaic Greece to the Middle Ages. See in particular Cohen (esp. 125–128) on the importance of metaphor in "Cicero's Roman Exile" and Fantham on the rich rhetorical posturing in "Seneca's Consolations to Helvia and Polybius." Indeed, Cicero's personal testimony of exile and Seneca's Stoic rejection of it as an evil offer several points of comparison in prose to Ovid's exilic verse, on which see Claassen 1999.

[10] Marg 1959, 349–350, notes in this connection that Ovid and Augustus are the only two mentioned by name, as author and addressee, in all five books of *Tristia*. The *Perilla* from *Tr.* 3.7 is probably a pseudonym as Marg 1959, 350 n. 2, suggests; Harrison 2002, 91 n. 61: "surely a sobriquet in Ovid;" though see Evans 1983, 59 with n. 16.

[11] This distinction is established in the first two poems from exile, *Tr.* 1.1.24: *et peragar populi publicus ore reus* "and as a defendant before the people I shall be on trial in their conversation;" 1.2.64: *culpa mea est ipso iudice* [sc. Caesare] *morte minor* "My fault is unworthy of death in the eyes of Caesar himself, who acted as judge."

the very public position he comes to hold throughout the empire. In consequence of such a development a minor wrong against Augustus as a private individual becomes a public crime against the state.[12]

It is important to see here that Ovid's representation of his legal status in exile belongs to the poetic reconstruction of his circumstances there and is, in this regard, highly contrived. If what he says about Roman law appears anomalous or even contradictory to our knowledge of imperial juridical procedure at the time of his banishment,[13] it is so in all likelihood because it serves greater poetical ends. In effect, due legal process becomes subsumed under the larger aims of the poetry. In what follows, I hope to show that at least one of those aims is to reveal that the poet suffered an injustice at the hands of the emperor. Indeed, the terms of the law that Ovid uses to represent his legal status in exile appear to have been chosen expressly to heighten the contrast between the mildness of the offense—it was a mistake (*error*)—and the severity of the punishment—it was an alternative to execution (*exilium*).

Such a view is of course determined by the one-sided nature of the evidence. Nothing from Augustus' side of the case has come down to us, except perhaps for Ovid's quotation of the language of the edict (*Tr.* 2.137, 5.2.57, 5.11.21–22). This is not in itself surprising given the stingy and otherwise capricious nature of history in matters of transmission. Yet it testifies to the poet's popularity through the ages and serves to remind us in reading these poems that Ovid stands in relation to the emperor not just as a private citizen but as a poet and *uates*.[14] This is of crucial significance to understanding the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto*, where the poet invites the reader to imagine his own very personal experience of exile in relation to the position of the poet generally in the recently restructured Rome of Augustus. In the longer perspective, Ovid claims to be writing for the benefit of posterity (e.g. *Tr.* 4.10.2), and it may be that his isolation in exile raised profound doubts about the overall well-being of the art of poetry within the relatively new and rapidly developing institution of the Roman principate. At the very

---

[12] See Watson 1992, 29, on the traditional distinction in Roman law as defined by Ulpian (*dig.* 1.1.1.2) between public and private law: the former relates to the commonwealth and its governmental and religious institutions, the latter to the interests of individuals as humans, citizens, and non-citizens.

[13] See the scholarly debate on the matter in nn. 1–3. On the uniqueness of Ovid's situation, cf. Raaflaub and Sammons 1990, 445–446; and below 48 with n. 47.

[14] Cf. Kenney 1982, 445.

least, he is reflecting in these poems on the relationship of *poeta* to *princeps* at Rome (and wherever they were read); tellingly, his reflection occasions unremitting lament.

The Law and Ovid

In analyzing the language of the law in Ovid one has to be careful not to make the poet into a legal scholar.[15] This is not as easy as it sounds; for Roman literature is saturated to the core with terms of the law, and many words in the Latin language often carry a legal significance outside any immediate legal context.[16] A word as simple and ubiquitous as *res*, for example, can easily be construed in terms of the law, and it is often difficult to know when it has become part of a metaphor or word-play based in legal terminology.[17] Still, it may be noted that of all the Augustan poets Ovid most often adopts the language of the law court in keeping with his reputation as an accomplished orator.[18] In an important paper, "Ovid and the Law," E.J. Kenney demonstrates how the poet "drew on the sphere of law for metaphor and illustration."[19] Kenney's study is not meant to be comprehensive, and it does not treat the texts of the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto*. In the main, it analyzes Ovid's love poetry, and in particular his *Heroides*. But in the exile poetry Ovid is no longer a love-poet, by definition opposed to the world of *negotium*; he is rather a confessed transgressor who has been punished for all to see. Not surprisingly, his attention to the law here veers towards an obsession.

Ovid's careful concern for Roman legal terminology in the exile poetry can readily be demonstrated by how often he refers to his crimes and the punishments they received. The repetitive nature of the exile poetry makes raw accounting somehow less valid as a tool of interpretation (and I want to be careful to avoid what used to be referred to as the "index-card" approach and may now be termed the "PHI-"

---

[15] Kenney 1969, 243, notes that in 1811 Van Iddekinge called Ovid *iuris scientia consultissimus* ("deeply learned in the law"), a view Kenney goes on to correct, cf. *ib.* 263.

[16] Crook 1967, 8.

[17] As Kenney 1969, 255, demonstrates on the basis of Ov. *Ep.* 20.149–151.

[18] See Kenney 1969, 253, for a comparison of some legal terms in the Augustan poets.

[19] Kenney 1969, 261.

or "Google-method" to reading poetry); yet it cannot be insignificant that by a conservative estimate at least one-fifth of these poems contain direct references to his legal status in exile.[20] For example, in the second poem from the first book of the *Tristia* Ovid calls upon the gods of the sky and the sea (59–106) for help because his ship has come into the middle of a storm. In the course of the prayer he reflects upon what he has been charged with having committed, *Tr.* 1.2.97–100:

> si tamen acta deos numquam mortalia fallunt,
> a culpa facinus scitis abesse mea.
> immo ita si scitis, si me merus[21] abstulit error,
> stultaque mens nobis, non scelerata fuit…

> If however the gods are never tricked by the deeds of a mortal, you know that my fault was far from criminal. If indeed you know this, if a mere mistake misled me, and my mind was prone to folly, not criminality…

Ovid uses technical terms of the law here, *culpa, facinus, error, scelerata* (viz. *scelus*), to clarify the legal nature of his transgression. The word *error*, for example, is similar to *ignorantia* and means "mistake without intent;" as a legal term, it derives in the main from private law and in particular from contracts and testaments.[22] Regarding the procedure involved in its prosecution, it amounts to a tort or a legal breach whereby the wronged party acquires the right of action for a private settlement of damages. A tort in Roman law is usually called *delictum*, a term which Ovid uses on several occasions to describe what he

[20] That is 23 of 97 poems, including *Ibis*: *Tr.* 1.2.99–100; 1.3.36; 1.9.63–64; 2.129–138; 3.5.51–52; 3.6.25–26, 35; 3.11.33–36; 4.1.23–24; 4.4.43–44; 4.5.7–8; 4.9.11–12; 4.10.89–90; 5.2.55–58; 5.8.23–24; 5.11.9–10, 21; *Pont.* 1.6.19–26; 1.7.39–42; 2.3.91–92; 2.9.67–71; 3.3.72–76; 3.9.11–14; 4.1.5–6; *Ib.* 11–12. The figures from Claassen 1986, 63–65 (Table 1), can be compared here and below nn. 22, 24–26, though I do not follow her method of grouping the exile poetry into five historical "phases."

[21] Camps' emendation for *meus* of the mss., cf. Hall 1995, ad loc.

[22] Berger 1953, *Error*. Kaser 1971, 237–239, with bibliography; cf. e.g. Ulp. *dig.* 18.1.9; Nerat. *dig.* 41.10.5.1: *in alieni facti ignorantia tolerabilis error est* "ignorance of the action of a third party gives a mistake a degree of acceptability;" Pompon. *dig.* 44.7.57: *in omnibus negotiis trahendis, siue bona fide sint siue non sint, si error aliquis interuenit, ut aliud sentiat puta qui emit aut qui conducit, aliud qui cum his contrahit, nihil ualet quod acti sit* "in conducting all business transactions, whether in good faith or not, if some mistake is found, as for example those buying or renting believe one thing and the person dealing with them something else, then the entire transaction is void;" Gaius *Inst.* 1.67: *ex senatus consulto permittitur causam erroris probare* "according to senatorial decree it is permissable to justify the reason for a mistake;" Scaev. *dig.* 46.3.102.3: *per errorem et ignorantiam* "by mistake and ignorance;" Paul. *dig.* 4.1.2 *(de in integrum restitutionibus): siue per status mutationem aut iustum errorem* "(On full restitution): either on account of a change in status or a legitimate mistake."

is accused of having done.[23] A *delictum* does not in itself involve a crime and is to be distinguished in classical terminology from *crimen* by the fact that the latter was prosecuted in a trial after a formal accusation and punished by a public penalty, while the former was prosecuted privately and punished by a fine paid to the individual who was wronged.[24] But again, in Ovid's case there does not seem to have been any formal accusation or public trial, and it is unlikely the poet is using *crimen* in a technical sense to be distinguished from *delictum*. Rather, it seems that Ovid uses *crimen*, *delictum*, and *peccatum* (*peccare*) interchangeably to refer generally to the alleged misdeeds, namely *carmen* and *error*, that brought about his exile.[25] Still, it is possible to discern what impression the poet tried to convey regarding the liability of these *duo crimina* because he repeatedly associates his wrongdoing with the word *culpa*.[26]

As a legal term, *culpa* generally indicates "fault" and in terms of liability falls under "negligence."[27] As in the above passage (*Tr.* 1.2.98),

---

[23] *Tr.* 2.578; 4.8.39; 5.6.21; *Pont.* 1.7.41; 3.9.7.

[24] Berger 1953, *Crimen* and *Delictum*; cf. Frier 1989, 1. On *delictum* as "tort," see Owen 1924, 289, ad *Tr.* 2.578, who posits that in a strict legal sense *delictum* is a wrong involving *dolus* and is thus opposed to *error*. He is right, but both *error* and *delictum* are to be classed under private (not public) wrongs which are punishable by fines.

[25] *Crimen* appears 59 times in the exile poetry, and every passage need not be listed here. Perhaps the best example for the usage of *crimen* comes from a passage cited above (38 with n. 6), *Tr.* 2.207: *duo crimina, carmen et error*, and similarly from the one under discussion, *Tr.* 1.2.96: [nec]... *crimina defendi fasque piumque puto* "Nor do I think it lawful and right that my crimes be defended;" and cf. *Pont.* 1.7.44: *stultitiam dici crimina posse mea* "my crimes can be called 'folly'." On *delictum*, *Tr.* 2.578; 4.8.39; 5.6.21; *Pont.* 1.7.41; 3.9.7; 4.1.6; on *peccatum* (*peccare*), *Tr.* 1.8.49; 2.1.31, 315, 539; 3.5.50; 3.6.33–34; 4.4.44; 5.2.60; 5.8.23; 5.11.17; *Pont.* 1.1.66; 1.6.21; 2.2.105; 2.3.33; 2.6.5; 2.9.75; 3.5.21; 3.9.6.

[26] For *culpa* in relation to Ovid's crimes see *Tr.* 1.2.98–99; 1.3.38; 2.104, 208, 315, 540; 3.5.51–52; 3.11.65: *utque meae famam tenuent obliuia culpae* "that forgetfulness may diminish the notoriety of my fault;" 4.4.10; 4.4.37; 5.2.33; 5.4.18; 5.6.17; 5.8.24; 5.11.10; *Pont.* 1.6.25–26; 1.7.39–40; 2.2.15; 2.3.46, 86; 2.6.7; 2.7.51; 2.9.76; 3.3.74; 4.1.5–6; 4.6.15; 4.14.23.

[27] Paul. *dig.* 9.2.31; cf. Daube 1969, 131, on *culpa* as one of the three standards of liability in Roman law between *dolus* "evil intent" and *casus* "accident." *Culpa* stands primarily in distinction to *facinus* and *scelus*, e.g. *Pont.* 1.6.25: *quidquid id est, ut non facinus, sic culpa uocanda est* "as it was no 'crime', whatever it is ought to be called a 'negligent mistake';" and *Tr.* 1.3.38: *pro culpa ne scelus esse putet* "lest he think it's a 'crime' instead of a 'mistake';" and 4.4.37: *hanc quoque, qua perii, culpam scelus esse negabis* "you will also agree that this mistake, by which I've come to ruin, is no crime," Still, there may be a progression from *Tristia* 1.2.98: *a culpa facinus scitis abesse mea* "you know that criminal intent is absent from my fault;" to 3.5.51: *non equidem totam possum defendere culpam* "for my part, I cannot defend my fault entirely;" to 5.2.33: *hinc ego traicerer (neque enim mea culpa cruenta est)* "from here I might be transferred—for my fault has no blood on it."

the poet consistently distinguishes *culpa*, on the one hand, from *facinus* and *scelus*, "serious criminal offense," on the other.[28] In fact, *facinus* is used primarily and *scelus* exclusively in relation to his crime to define what it was not.[29] Ovid may still be using these terms for metaphor and illustration as Kenney has shown is the case in his earlier work, but an understanding of what in particular the poet is trying to illustrate in the consistent contrast of *error / culpa* with *scelus / facinus* requires the direct engagement with the literal meanings of Roman legal terms. Our knowledge of these terms is of course imperfect, and their meaning was no doubt the cause for debate in Ovid's day. Yet the legal status of the poet in exile, in particular the consistency with which he defines it, is a major theme in these poems. In short, I would go further than Professor Kenney:

> Ovid's brushes with the law seem to have lacked the traumatic quality that later clamours imperiously for release in artistic shape ... but the law left its mark on him, and may claim some small part in the formation of the most versatile poet of classical antiquity.[30]

Kenney's "mark" becomes a scar in the exile poetry with the ensuing trauma that follows banishment in the loss of family, city, and

---

Indeed, the word takes on greater significance in the *Epistulae ex Ponto*, e.g. 1.6.26: *omnis an in magnos culpa deos scelus est?* "is every mistake against the great gods a crime?" 2.2.15–16: *est mea culpa grauis, sed quae me perdere solum / ausa sit, et nullum maius adorta nefas* "my mistake is serious, but one which dared to destroy me alone without attempting a greater crime."

[28] This distinction is not uncommon in Latin literature, e.g. Cic. *Marc.* 13: *etsi aliqua culpa teneremur erroris humani, ab scelere certe liberati sumus* "Although we were caught by some fault of human error, we were at any rate free from cime;" cf. *TLL* V.2.817.63–75, and Sen. *Her. Fur.* 1237–1238: [Amph.] *quis nomen usquam sceleris errori addidit?/* [Herc.] *saepe error ingens sceleris obtinuit locum* "[Amph.] Whoever gave the name of crime to a mistake? [Herc.] Often has a great mistake earned the status of crime." Mommsen 1955, 9 n. 4, lists both *facinus* and *scelus* under "die sacralen oder ethischen Ausdrücke" along with *peccatum* (see above n. 25) and *nefas*, which Ovid also uses to describe what his fault was not. Of the three other words in Mommsen's list *probrum* (disgrace) and *flagitium* (outrage) do not appear in the exile poetry, *maleficium* (misdeed) cannot *metri causa*.

[29] *Facinus*: *Tr.* 2.526: *inque oculis facinus barbara mater habet* "the barbaric mother had crime in her eyes," refers to Medea, otherwise to what Ovid's crime was not, *Tr.* 2.307; 3.1.52; 4.4.44; 4.9.1; 5.2.17; 5.11.17; *Pont.* 1.6.25; 1.7.40. *Scelus*: *Tr.* 1.3.38; 3.6.25; 3.11.34; 4.1.24; 4.4.37; 4.10.90; 5.4.18; 5.8.23; *Pont.* 1.6.26; 3.6.13. *Scelus* has as its primary meaning "guilt incurred by a transgression of religious taboo," and is the strongest of terms for crime in Latin, cf. Plaut. *Pers.* 554–560.

[30] Kenney 1969, 263.

reputation.[31] This trauma clamors for and duly finds ample release from the first book of the *Tristia* to the last *ex Ponto*.

In what follows, I shall evaluate how the terms of Roman law that Ovid uses to define the nature of his deed can be brought to bear on an appraisal of his punishment. The problem of punishment in Roman law is vexed and lies beyond the scope of this study. I have therefore restricted my focus here to three (legal) issues: *relegatio*, *carmen*, and *error*. More generally, the following analysis addresses a question that hovers over the exile poetry from the start: how is the reader to reconcile the severity of the punishment—banishment to Tomis (*relegatio*)—with the mildness of the offense—a mistake (*error*) and an act of writing (*carmen*)? This question, if it is not ignored, often receives implicit answer grounded in the common knowledge that Augustus became less tolerant and increasingly autocratic in the final phase of his rule. As proof of the emperor's growing intolerance the cases of the orators Titus Labienus and Cassius Severus are usually adduced.[32] The former's works were burned by senatorial decree, a fact which seems to have driven him to suicide.[33] Tacitus relates that the latter was exiled on the charge of treason (*maiestas*), *Ann.* 1.72:

> facta arguebantur, dicta inpune erant. primus Augustus cognitionem de famosis libellis specie legis eius [*sc. maiestatis*] tractauit, commotus Cassii Seueri libidine, qua uiros feminasque inlustris procacibus scriptis diffamauerat.

---

[31] *Pont.* 1.3.15: *tempore ducetur longo fortasse cicatrix* "after a long time perhaps a scar will form," of his wounds in exile; cf. Labate 1988, 91.

[32] Knox 2001, 173–181, suggests that in the latter years of the first principate (c. post 7 AD) Tiberius, and *not* Augustus, was the *de facto* enforcer of exile of writers such as Cassius Severus and Ovid. The case of famous general and fellow elegist, C. Cornelius Gallus, from a generation before Ovid provides an interesting parallel. It is unclear what exactly caused Gallus' fall in 27 or 26 BC, although it not likely to be a conspiracy nor anything he wrote. Nevertheless, as the young *princeps*, Octavian may have found distateful Gallus' boastful account of his accomplishments in the fascinating trilingual inscription from Philae, a small island in the Nile south of Elephantine (*CIL* III.14147^{5}). Gordon 1983, 98, calls the inscription "unique" and allows that it may have been "one item among the reasons for Augustus's (apparent) recall of Gallus" from the prefecture of Egypt in 29 BC. Whatever the reason, his reputation was ruined, and probably before he could be condemned by the senate, he finally committed suicide in 26. Cf. Raaflaub and Samons 1990, 423–425, for a concise overview.

[33] On Labienus, see Sen. *controv.* 10, *pref.* 4–10. See Dio 56.27.1 on the burning of noxious pamphlets in 12 AD, and Syme 1978, 229, who notes that since Ovid had not been banned by senatorial decree, his books could not be burned.

> It used to be that deeds were cause for accusation, and words went unpunished. Augustus was the first to conduct on the pretext of treason a judicial inquiry concerning libelous books, moved as he was by the license with which Cassius Severus had defamed important men and women in his impudent writings.[34]

Ovid's *Ars Amatoria* was removed from the public libraries (*Tr.* 3.1.59–82; 3.14.5–8), and he was banished from the city. The severity of this punishment has led scholars to posit that the charge must have been *maiestas*.[35] But the poet never actually says so and even denies any involvement in the types of crimes—open insurrection (*Tr.* 2.51), plots or scandals (*Tr.* 3.5.45–50)—that would normally lead an emperor to invoke the *lex maiestatis*.[36] Ovid does, however, give us two concrete charges, *duo crimina*, a poem and a mistake, *carmen et error*.

From his open letter to the emperor, we learn that the *carmen*, the *Ars Amatoria*, was deemed obscene (*turpe*) while Ovid himself was charged with being "a teacher of foul adultery," *Tr.* 2.211–212: *turpi carmine factus / arguor obsceni doctor adulterii*. Syme is no doubt right to insist that the two charges, *carmen et error*, be taken "in a tight nexus."[37] Yet it is still

[34] The date of Severus' exile is in dispute. Usually dated to 12 AD, thus *PIR*^{2}, C 522, but Syme 1978, 213–214, argues for 8 AD, accepted by Knox 2001, 174–175; Wiedemann 1975, 268, puts it in 7 AD. On the possible link between Labienus and Severus, cf. Raaflaub and Samons 1990, 441 with n. 102, and 444 for an analysis of this passage in context.

[35] Owen 1924, 38–47, esp. 40–42. He notes that the latitude of *maiestas* (treason) had been strained by Augustus, Tac. *Ann.* 1.72 (cited above); 2.50; 3.24: [Augustus] *adulterosque earum morte aut fuga puniuit, nam culpam inter uiros ac feminas uulgatam graui nomine laesarum religionum ac uiolatae maiestatis appellando clementiam maiorum suasque ipse leges* [sc. legem Iuliam de adulteriis] *egrediebatur* "Augustus punished his daughters' adulterers with death or exile. For in calling a common fault among both men and women by the harsh name of sacrilege and treason he went beyond his elders' clemency as well as his own laws on adultery." For others on the charge of *maiestas*, see Fränkel 1945, 111; Thibault 1964, 8–10; more cautious is Green 1982, 209: "[the argument for *laesa maiestas*] is persuasive and may well be true, but we have to bear in mind that Ovid never actually says so." Against the charge of *maiestas* is Grasmück 1978, 135, who argues, 128 with n. 463, that Augustus banished Ovid by the power of *imperium proconsulare maius* (greater proconsular power) on which see Jones 1960, 14, and 178 n. 42: "The power of *relegatio* was dependent on *imperium* … Augustus could have claimed as a precedent the *relegatio* of a Roman knight by Gabinius as consul in 58 BC (Cic. *pro Sestio* 29–30)."

[36] *Maiestas* is never used in the meaning "treason," though the word expresses the "grandeur of the emperor" at *Tr.* 2.510; *Pont.* 2.8.30; 3.1.156 (of Livia); 4.8.56; 4.9.68. There is a good summary of what Ovid's *crimen* was not in Goold 1983, 100: he did not break law (*Pont.* 2.9.71), murder, poison, forge (*Pont.* 2.9.67–70.), rebel (*Tr.* 2.51), conspire, spread scandal, commit sacrilege (*Tr.* 3.5.45), profit from sin (*Tr.* 3.6.34). Cf. Grasmück 1978, 135–136.

[37] Syme 1978, 222; Grasmück 1978, 135–136.

worth asking here how it was that poetry (*carmen*), even if indecent, ever became a crime at all. Indeed, in the history of the republic there is no obvious case in which writing was cause for criminal prosecution at Rome, where freedom of expression had always been (or was said to be) highly valued and widely respected.[38] There is, however, a remark of Cicero, preserved in Augustine's *City of God*, that suggests that, in contrast to the Greeks, the Romans put strictures on what could be said on stage or, more precisely, who could be attacked in public verse (*C.D.* 2.9). Augustine paraphrases a passage from the (now mostly lost) fourth book of Cicero's *de Republica* (11–12, Ziegler), in which Scipio Africanus compares Greek and Roman comedy by noting *ut quod uellet comoedia de quo uellet nominatim diceret* "[Greek] comedy could say what it wanted about whom it wanted by name." At Rome, however—and here we have what Cicero himself put into the mouth of Scipio—it was a capital offense *siue quis occentauisset siue carmen condidisset quod infamiam faceret flagitiumue alteri* "if anyone had sung or written a poem that brought shame or scandal on another."[39]

This passage has often been used to interpret the story, recorded in Aulus Gellius (fl. c. 170 AD), that the epic poet and dramatist, Gnaeus Naevius (c. 264–201 BC), was imprisoned for his *Spottgedichte* or certain elements in the comedies he wrote against the leading men of Rome and that he may even have been banished to Utica where he is said to have died in exile.[40] Given the disparity in the social status of the early

---

[38] There is a good discussion in Frank 1927 and Momigliano 1942; see Wirszubski 1950, 27–30.

[39] This passage can only arbitrarily be associated with the fragment of XII Tables reported by Pliny *Nat.* 28.18: *qui malum carmen incantassit* "who had uttered an evil magic spell," so Momigliano 1942, 121, who argues that the verb *occentare*, recorded in Festus (p. 181M), "has no magical connotation;" cf. *OLD* s.v. *occento*. Horace states that a similar law on libel, *Epist.* 2.1.152–153: *lex / poenaque lata malo quae nollet carmine quemquam / describi* "a law was passed with a punishment forbidding that anyone be described in abusive verse," changed the course of Latin poetry from rustic satire (145: *fescennina licentia*) to the adaptation of Greek poetic forms, 156–157: *Graecia capta ferum victorem cepit et artis / intulit agresti Latio* "captive Greece took its savage victor captive and brought the arts to rustic Latium," on which see Brink 1982, 179–201. Compare the late-third cent. (c. 297) rhetorician and Christian apologist from Numidia, Arnobius *adv. nat.* 4.34: *carmen malum conscribere, quo fama alterius coinquinetur et uita, decemuiralibus scitis euadere noluistis inpune, ac ne uestras aures conuicio aliquis petulantiore pulsaret, de atrocibus formulas constituistis iniuriis* "In the decrees of the decemvirs you decided that composing a libellous poem, which besmirches the reputation and life of another, would not go unpunished; you also established legal proceedings for bitter injuries lest someone offend your ears with rather impudent abuse."

[40] Gell. *Noct. Att.* 3.3.15 on imprisonment; Jer. *Chron.* 135 on death in exile in Utica.

playwrights and the *principes ciuitatis* such as the Metelli and Scipiones whom the poet is reported to have slandered,[41] it is conceivable that Naevius spent some time in prison for what he wrote, especially under the strained set of circumstances at Rome brought on by the closing phases of the second Punic War.[42] Yet even if it is accepted that Naevius was punished for what he wrote (and it is far from certain that he was), his would be the only such case on record for the republican period.[43] At the close the second century BC the scope of *iniuria* "unlawful conduct" was extended to include defamation,[44] and later in the next century Sulla sought to curb slander "under the cover of *maiestas*."[45] The last two centuries of the Roman republic, however, do not lack for poets and prose writers willing to attack political and social enemies in scathing tones by name. It was only under Augustus that *dicta*, or what was said, came to be cause (and perhaps only for Ovid) for criminal prosecution.[46]

Indeed, Ovid's case is in every respect peculiar; and understanding the nature of its pecularity is critical for reading the exile poetry.[47] In the case of Cassius Severus, for example, it must be recalled that under

---

[41] Jer. *Chron.* 135; Gell. *Noct. Att.* 7.8.5, Pseudo-Asconius ad Cic. *Verr.* 1.29: *dictum facete et contumeliose in Metellos antiquum Naeui est: 'fato Metelli Romae fiunt consules'. cui tunc Metellus consul iratus uersu responderat senario hypercatalecto, qui et Saturnius dicitur: 'dabunt malum Metelli Naeuio poetae'.* "There is an old saying of Naevius, which he leveled wittily and slanderously against the Metelli: 'by divine decree the Metelli are made consuls at Rome', to which one of the Metelli, who was then consul, responded angrily in a hypercatalectic Senarius (also called the Saturnian verse): 'The Metelli will make trouble for Naevius the poet'."

[42] So Jocelyn 1969, 37; Mattingly 1960, however, discounts the imprisonment and the fact that Plautus' *poeta barbarus* sitting in prison at *Mil.* 210–212 refers to Naevius; Frank 1927, 109–110, accepts the imprisonment and subsequent exile of Naevius as the result of the "war-nervousness" rather than any ban on libel in the XII Tables.

[43] Frank 1927, 109.

[44] Two passages in *Rhet. Her.* (1.24; 2.19) contain the only two cases of charges for verbal injury reported in republican times, both involving mimes, i.e. slaves; cf. Momigliano 1942, 122; Frank 1927, 109.

[45] Momigliano 1942, 123.

[46] Knox 2001, 165. Cf. *Tr.* 2.567–568: *inter tot populi, tot scriptis, milia nostri, / quem mea Calliope laeserit, unus ego* "among myriad writings of so many people, I'm the only one my Muse has wounded."

[47] Raaflaub and Samons 1990, 445–446: "Ovid's banishment could scarcely have been indicative of a concerted policy on the part of Augustus to repress freedom of speech ... we can only infer that the exile of Ovid was a singluar event." In conclusion, they write, 446: "The conclusion is inescapable and supported by all the sources at all points: the cases of "censorship" listed above [e.g. Ovid's and Severus'] are rare exceptions in Augustus' reign. Although they are concentrated in its last phase, they represent isolated incidents and provide no sufficient foundation for a theory of heightened political censorship in this period."

the *lex maiestatis* the emperor was ready to punish slander with death, which could often be avoided by going into exile. Severus' crime lay in the fact that he disgraced the names of the influential men and women whom he attacked (Tac. *Ann.* 1.72: *uiros feminasque inlustris … diffamauerat*). Ovid, however, claims that his own writings were free from slander (*Tr.* 2.563–564; 3.5.47–48), and indeed the poet never attacks individuals as Severus is reported to have done.[48] In *Tristia* 2, moreover, he notes that had Augustus had time to read his *Ars*, he would not have been able to find a crime in it, *Tr.* 2.240: *nullum legisses crimen in Arte mea*. He reminds the emperor that many poets had written on similar subjects and that the didactic love poetry of Tibullus had been tolerated under his own rule (*Tr.* 2.447–464).[49] Again, Ovid's is a special case, and he wants his readers—the *princeps* included—to know it.[50] In short, the branding of the *Ars* as indecent (*Tr.* 2.211–212) is an anomaly in Roman history, the product of the very particular relationship between the poet and the emperor on display in the exile poetry. Even so, this problem becomes even more puzzling when we consider that the *Ars* had been published between 1 BC and 2 AD and had to have gone at least six years unheeded by the emperor and his court before it was banned from the public libraries.[51] The lag-time corresponds conveniently to

[48] Even in the scathing invective from exile, *Ibis*, and the several poems like it from the exilic corpus (*Tr.* 1.8; 3.11; 4.9; 5.8; *Pont.* 4.3), Ovid never openly names the object of his reproach. Cf. also *Pont.* 4.14.44: *extat adhuc nemo saucius ore meo* "to this day there is no one wounded by what I've said." The rest of this poem is also important for this issue, 37–42: *non loca sed mores scriptis uexauit amaris / Scepsius Ausonios, actaque Roma rea est: / falsa tamen passa est aequa conuicia mente, / obfuit auctori nec fera lingua suo. / at malus interpres populi mihi concitat iram / inque nouum crimen carmina nostra uocat.* "Not the land, but the ways of Italy were attacked in bitter writing by Metrodorus of Scepsis and Rome was put on trial: yet she bore the false insults with an even keel, and the author's savage tongue brought him no harm. But a new agent stirs up the people's anger against me and invokes a new charge against my poetry."

[49] See esp. *Tr.* 2.463–464: *non fuit hoc illi fraudi, legiturque Tibullus / et placet, et iam te principe tutus erat* "this brought him no harm, and Tibullus continues to be read with pleasure and was safe even in your principate." (N. b. *tutus* is Hall's conjecture for the mss. *notus*.)

[50] Cf. *Tr.* 2.361–362: *denique conposui teneros non solus amores: / conposito poenas solus amore dedi* "In short, I was not the only one to have composed tender love poems, but I am the only one to have been punished for composing them."

[51] *Tr.* 2.539–546: *nos quoque iam pridem scripto peccauimus isto: / supplicium patitur non noua culpa nouum; / carminaque edideram, cum te delicta notantem / praeterii totiens rite citatus eques. / ergo quae iuuenis mihi non nocitura putaui / scripta parum prudens, nunc nocuere seni. / sera redundauit ueteris uindicta libelli, / distat et a meriti tempore poena sui* "Long ago I also sinned in writing that kind of verse: no new fault suffers a new penalty, and I had already published poems, when so many times as a knight I passed by you aware of my sins

the composition period of the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti* but otherwise suffers no satisfactory explanation.

As is probably evident by now, the poet's reticence on the substance of his *error* makes the discussion of it difficult and accounts for seemingly irresolvable confusion.[52] At the same time, it is clear that whatever Ovid's "mistake" may have been, according to the practice in Roman private law an individual found guilty of having committed an *error* had only to redress the wrong and was not punished beyond the appropriate (usually undisclosed) indemnity.[53] Even when the poet refers to his crime as a *delictum*, that too was normally prosecuted privately and punished by a fine paid to the plaintiff. Moreover, the term *culpa*, which is used consistently in the exile poetry to delimit the liability of the fault, incurred no penalty at all unless a judge decided the wrongdoer had acted with intent (*sciens dolo malo*).[54] But the poet is unequivocal about the absence of intent,[55] and an explanation for this very severe and public punishment has to be found elsewhere. It seems that Ovid's use of a term from the area of private law, *error*, as a (partial) cause of his banishment corresponds to a larger historical development alluded to elsewhere in the exile poetry whereby the private house of the Caesars came to control the public domain at Rome.[56] In consequence of just

without being called to account. Thus the writings which in my youth I somewhat foolishly thought would not harm me, have now harmed me in old age. The vengeance for an old book has been excessive and late in coming, and the penalty is far away in time from when it was deserved."

[52] Rosiello 2002, 460–461, discusses the significance of *error* in juridical and rhetorical contexts, but generally eschews an analysis of the term in its legal sense in her lengthy discussion, "Semantica di *error* in Ovidio." There she discerns "tre ambiti fondamentali" (425) for the use of *error* in Ovid's work as a whole: 1. literal wandering (limited in Ovid); 2. mistake or madness (usually in the erotic language of Roman elegy); 3. path between *culpa* and *crimen* (in the poet's self-representation in exile). She concludes that the term *error* serves to link Ovid's exilic œuvre with his earlier work, 461–462: "rimane, poi, l'uomo, l'*exclusus amator*, che ora impronta la sua ultima elegia sulla vincenda personale, sul suo *error*, sulla propria *culpa*, dando sì spazio al proprio vissuto, ma operando, in virtù di questo, la riformulazione del genere elegiaco che proprio ora, sotto il peso delle sue vincende personali, fa da ponte tra due momenti di vita constituendo quell'unità di poesia sancita dalla sopravvivenza attraverso il rinnovamento."

[53] Berger 1953, *Error*.

[54] Berger 1953, *Culpa*.

[55] Cf. *Tr.* 1.2.99–100; 4.4.43–44: *ergo ut iure damus poenas, sic afuit omne / peccato facinus consiliumque meo* "Thus I'm legitimately punished, and absolutely no criminal intent was involved in my transgression;" *Pont.* 1.6.19–20.

[56] *Pont.* 2.1.18: *priuati nil habet illa domus* [sc. Caesarea] "that house of the Caesars holds nothing private."

such a development, a mild wrong committed against the *princeps* as a private individual becomes a serious crime in the eyes of the state and thus worthy of the most stringent and widely public punishment.

The exact nature of the punishment for Ovid's wrong was made known to the people in an edict issued by the emperor himself. The words of the edict, though harsh and threatening, were again specially formulated to fit Ovid's fate, calling him *relegatus* instead of *exul*.[57] Of course, the poet uses the term *exul* for himself in the third line of the exile poetry[58] but in general maintains the distinction the Romans made between *relegatio* and *exilium*.[59] Both required that the condemned leave the city while staying inside the *limes* of Roman territory at a specified distance from Rome.[60] They differed in that *exilium* brought with it the loss of citizenship and the subsequent confiscation of property, while *relegatio* allowed the condemned to keep both, as Ovid himself notes thankfully on several occasions.[61] Depending on the severity of the crime or the circumstance of the trial (if there was one), the condemned was often free to choose the destination of his banishment in the republican period as long as it lay beyond the distance specified in the decree (again, if there was one). During the imperial period it became increasingly more common for the emperor himself to choose the territory of exile, such as a remote or barren island like Pandateria in the case of the elder Julia or Crete in the case of Cassius Severus (Tac. *Ann.* 4.21).[62]

In Ovid's case the emperor chose Tomis as the place of exile.[63] Yet as far as we know, relegation to the region of the Black Sea was unprecedented in the republic and under Augustus, and the entire

---

57 *Tr.* 1.7.8; 2.137; 5.2.57–58; 5.11.21–22.

58 *Tr.* 1.1.3: *sed incultus, qualem decet exulis esse* "but unkempt, as is fitting for what belongs to an exile."

59 Kelly 2006, 65–67, esp. 67 where he notes that *relegatio* was rarely used against Roman citizens in the Republic but "became a frequent criminal punishment in the early Empire." Cf. Grasmück 1978, 101–102; Garnsey 1970, 111–116; Mommsen 1955, 964–980, on the distinction between *relegatio*, *exilium*, and *deportatio*.

60 Cf. Grasmück 1978, 100–101; Berger 1953, *Exilium* and *Relegatio*.

61 *Tr.* 1.3; 4.5.7–8; 4.9.11–12; 5.11.9–10.

62 Grasmück 1978, 127–128.

63 Consider Nisbet 1982, 51 n. 22, on the possible connection of Ovid's own lost tragedy, *Medea*, to the place of his banishment: "One is tempted to suggest that Tomis was chosen for Ovid's banishment because it was where Medea chopped up her brother (cf. *Trist.* 3.9); sadistic merriment is the prerogative of autocrats. Perhaps the elder Julia was sent to Rhegium because her promiscuity and unfilial behaviour recalled Scylla . . . and Cassius Severus to Crete . . . because his gibes were regarded as lies."

history of exile from ancient Rome offers no other parallel. It is hardly suprising then that the poet draws our attention to the uniqueness of his predicament in his open appeal to the emperor, *Tr.* 2.187–194:

> ultima perpetior, medios eiectus in hostes,
> nec quisquam patria longius exul abest.
> solus ad egressus missus septemplicis Histri[64]
> Parrhasiae gelido uirginis axe premor;
> 193 cumque alii causa tibi sint grauiore fugati,[65]
> ulterior nulli, quam mihi, terra data est.

> I endure the extreme, cast out into the middle of the enemy, no exile is farther away from his native land. Sent into the mouths of seven-streamed Hister alone, I'm being crushed by the icy pole of the Parrhasian virgin. Though others have been exiled for more serious reasons, no one has been assigned to a land more remote than mine.

Simply put, the punishment does not fit the crime. Banishment from the city and the banning of the *Ars*, even if the poem was not burned and *relegatio* was more mild than *exilium*, are otherwise unprecedented and may be considered excessive for someone who claims to have been liable only for an act of negligence. In fact, Augustus' action, without claim to precedent or legitimacy, smacks of imperial authoritarianism.

Such a conclusion is hardly new,[66] though it deserves to be re-examined here in the light of the evidence that has to be used to reach it. Again, everything we know about Ovid's exile comes from the poems themselves, and apart from oblique references in Pliny (*Nat.* 32.152) and Statius (*Silv.* 1.2.254–255), an actual record of the poet's banishment does not appear until the translation of Eusebius' *Chronicle* by Jerome in 381 AD.[67] The late date of this text and its notoriously fatuous character make the very occurrence of Ovid's exile a problem of history that receives its only corroborative documentation in poetry. Ignorance of

[64] Cf. *Tr.* 5.12.10: *solus in extremos iussus abire Getas* "bidden to go alone to the Getans at the ends of the earth." In *Pont.* 1.3.61–84. Ovid gives a list of exiles known from Roman history, Greek philosophy, and a long tradition of myth in order to point up the singularity of his own circumstances. He ends the catalogue thus, 83–84: *persequar ut cunctos, nulli datus omnibus aeuis / tam procul a patria est horridiorue locus* "though I go through them all, to none in any age was given a more grim place so far away from his homeland."

[65] On the order of the lines, I follow Owen 1924; cf. Luck 1977, ad 187–206, and Hall 1995, ad loc.

[66] See Nugent 1990; Marache 1958, esp. 418–419, and cf. Kenney 1982, 445: "[there is] no room for doubt as to what Ovid thought of the way in which he had been treated. The message is clear: he was a victim of tyranny and injustice."

[67] Cf. Syme 1978, 215.

Ovid's *error* in particular has led scholars to describe his exile as a mystery to be solved by the just combination of diligent detective work and inspired divination.[68] G.P. Goold has reasonably entertained whether "the mystery felt by modern scholars is a genuine mystery, handed down by tradition from Ovid's own times."[69] For Goold himself, there is in fact no mystery because the poet states that the reason for his downfall was well-known at Rome, *Tr.* 4.10.99–100:

> causa meae cunctis nimirum nota ruinae
> indicio non est testificanda meo.
>
> The reason for my downfall is doubtless well known to all and need not be revealed by evidence of mine.

But this couplet covers up as much as it reveals and is often read with the skepticism it invites.[70] It ought be noted in this connection that the tone of the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* is often intentionally evasive, and not only regarding the poet's *error*.[71] Of the amount of ills he suffers in exile, for example, Ovid writes, *Tr.* 1.5.45–52:

---

[68] The title of Thibault 1964, *The Mystery of Ovid's Exile*, is a case in point; see above 20 n. 17 Hexter 2007, 212, argues for Ovid's self-conscious "production of enigma" and has noted that the perceived mystery behind his exile has "brought out the Sherlock Holmes in many of our scholarly confrères."

[69] Goold 1983, 94, whose point is rhetorical. He is convinced that Ovid was exiled for involvement, i.e. as abettor, in the adultery of Julia II with Junius Silanus, to which the *Ars* was added as part of a joint indictment. This theory continues to get traction (albeit warily: Conte 1994, 340; White 2002, 16–17; Watson 2002, 154–155), despite the detailed accounts of political conspiracy in Owen 1924, 31–36; Norwood 1963; Syme 1978, 199–229; Green 1982, with further bibliography.

[70] So Owen 1924, 16; Hollis 1977, xiv n. 2: "What all Rome knew was merely that Ovid had offended the emperor;" Luck 1977, ad *Tr.* 1.1.23f.; Green 1982, 206–207 with n. 31; contra is Goold 1983, 95: "a natural interpretation of the couplet is that, though the offense could not tactfully be discussed in public, everyone knew what it was." He cites in support *Pont.* 1.7.39–40: *et tamen ut cuperem culpam quoque posse negari, / sic facinus nemo nescit abesse mihi* "and yet even as I should wish the fault too to be able to be denied, so does everyone know that I am guilty of no crime."

[71] See also *Tr.* 5.7.5–6 [a letter to a friend]: *scilicet, ut semper, quid agam, carissime, quaeris, / quamuis hoc uel me scire tacente potes* "As always of course, you ask how I am doing, though you can know this even if I keep quiet." Still, *error* is apparently the more serious of his transgressions, cf. *Pont.* 3.3.71–76 [Amor speaks]: *utque hoc* [sc. Artis crimen], *sic utinam defendere cetera possem! / scis aliquid, quod te laeserit, esse, magis. / quicquid id est (neque enim debet dolor ipse referri, / nec potes a culpa dicere abesse tua) / tu licet erroris sub imagine crimen obumbres, / non grauior merito iudicis ira fuit* "Would that I could defend the rest of the charges as this one against the *Ars*! You know that something else has harmed you more. Whatever it is—for I ought not to go over the pain itself, nor can you say that you are free from fault—though you cover the crime under the guise of 'error', the anger of the judges was justifiably not too severe." Other passages for comparison:

scire meos casus siquis desiderat omnes,
  plus, quam quod fieri res sinit, ille petit.
tot mala sum passus, quot in aethere sidera lucent
  paruaque quot siccus corpora puluis habet:
multaque credibili tulimus maiora ratamque,
  quamuis acciderint, non habitura fidem.
pars etiam quaedam mecum moriatur oportet,
  meque uelim possit dissimulante tegi.

If anyone wants to know the sum of my misfortune, he seeks more than what the situation permits. I've suffered as many ills as the number of shining stars and of mites in dry dust: I've borne much beyond belief, which—though it happened—will never get any credit. A small part has to die with me too, and I'd like it to be covered up by my efforts to conceal.

Evidence from history—or its lack—proves that Ovid attained his wish and that complete knowledge of the circumstances surrounding his misfortune was lost upon his death. This has fired scholars and poets alike to reconstruct the circumstances of his exile from the poems themselves, even though the perilously one-sided nature of the sources encourages a degree of historical skepticism, if not willful ignorance.[72] For scholarly ignorance regarding the exact nature of Ovid's crimes does not prohibit his poems from providing important insights into the nature of the Augustan principate. Such an interpretive conceit relies on readings that are both literal and metaphorical. In a literal translation, for example, the combination *carmen et error* means "poem and mistake," or, equally plausibly, "song and wandering." A metaphorical translation, however, especially one that takes *duo crimina* "in a tight nexus," as Syme recommended,[73] could easily yield "poetry of wandering." My point here is not that we should disregard the reality of Ovid's *duo*

Tr. 3.6.32; *Pont.* 1.2.144; 1.6.21–22; 2.2.59: *lingua sile! non est ultra narrabile quicquam* "Silence, tongue! There's nothing else to be told;" 2.9.73–74; 3.1.147.

72 The US Tomb of Unknowns at Arlington National Cemetary provides a possible parallel. The bones of a previously unidentified soldier from the War in Vietnam, interred and bestowed with the medal of honor, were discovered by DNA testing to belong to Air Force First Lieutenant Michael J. Blassie of Florissant, Missouri (*NYTimes*, 7/12/98). When the Blassie family sought the medal of honor for their son, the request was denied on the grounds that the bones of the soldier had received the honor of being interred in the shrine at Arlington only because they were unknown (*NYTimes*, 8/23/98). The incident has led the US Department of Defense to abolish the practice of placing newfound remains in the Tomb of Unknowns because advancements in science make it "unlikely" not to recognize their origin (*NYTimes*, 2/5/99).

73 Syme 1978, 222.

crimina in favor of a metaphor suggestive of the very rubric—"exile poetry"—under which these poems are now classified. Rather, it is to remind us that the exact nature of Ovid's misdeeds, his *error* in particular, lies beyond our ken and that such knowledge, were it attainable, would not necessarily increase our understanding of his poetry. His careful attention to technical terms of the law and to Roman legal procedure as a whole serve greater poetic ends. In consequence, if the answers to the questions on the causes for Ovid's banishment—not to mention the historicity of his exile itself—lie among the forgotten facts of a fragmentary historical record, then an interpretation of his poetry depends all the more on the *carmina* themselves. Indeed, the poet's evasiveness on the subject of his *error* forces us to shift our focus to *carmen*, and not merely to the work the poet names—the *Ars*—but to the poetic act itself.[74] In the longer perspective, the most essential question that arises from a discussion of the legality of Ovid's banishment is the following: how did the writing of poetry ever come to be associated with criminal activity?

The crimen *in* carmen

In Latin the word for charge or crime, *crimen*, looks and sounds like the word for song or poem, *carmen*. This is even more true, for reasons of morphology and, later, paleography, when the words assume their dactylic form: *crimina / carmina*.[75] In the first two books of Ovid's *Tristia*, *carmina* was read for *crimina* in at least four instances in several of the best manuscripts in the vexed textual tradition of these poems.[76] The first appears in the first poem from exile, where the poet sends his bookroll to Rome with instructions, *Tr.* 1.1.17–24:

> siquis ut in populo nostri non inmemor illic,
> siquis, qui, quid agam, forte requirat, erit,
> uiuere me dices, saluum tamen esse negabis—
> id quoque, quod uiuam, munus habere dei—

[74] Cf. Watson 2002, 154–155.

[75] Willis 1972, 76, assigns to Markland the observation that in the copying of texts "dactylic words were confused with peculiar frequency," e.g. *numine / nomine, corpora / pectora, flamine / flumine / lumina / limina*.

[76] At *Tr.* 1.1.23; 1.2.96; 2.3; 2.9. See Tarrant 1983, 282–284; Hall 1995, xii–xv; and Richmond 2002, 475–477, on the manuscript tradition. Wilkinson 1955, 359, notes that "the first two books of the *Tristia* . . . should be considered apart."

atque ita tu tacitus—quaerenti plura legendum—
  ne, quae non opus est, forte loquare, caue.[77]
protinus admonitus repetet mea crimina lector,
  et peragar populi publicus ore reus.

If someone there among the people remembers me and perhaps asks how I am, say that I'm alive (but don't say I'm fine), and that I consider it the gift of a god that I'm even alive. For the rest be silent (whoever requires more should read you), and take care not to say what perhaps you should not. Once reminded the reader will recall my crimes immediately, and as a defendant before the people I shall be on trial in their talk.

A recent editor of the *Tristia*, John Barrie Hall (1995), has queried the authenticity of the final distich: "*an genuinum hoc distichon? numquam enim* populi ore *accusatus est poeta* (2.131 *s.*), *neque in ipso operis initio* crimina *se admisisse uoluisset confiteri*" (Is this distich Ovid's? For the poet was never charged with a crime by the "voice of the people," nor would he have wanted to admit at the very beginning of his work that he had committed "crimes"). To Hall's first point, that the poet was never charged directly by the people, the distich that follows provides a satisfactory response, *Tr.* 1.1.25–26:

neu te defendas, quamuis mordebere dictis:
  causa patrocinio non bona maior erit.

Although attacked by biting words, do not defend yourself; our case is not good and will be beyond legal defense.

The public punishment Ovid has received forces him to become a *reus publicus* (24), a defendant before the people for whom the punishment alone is presented as proof of guilt and cause for reproach (*mordebere dictis*).[78] The book is to keep silent not simply because the vagueness of the charges makes them nearly impossible to answer, but because any offense against the emperor, however small, lies beyond the legal defense of Rome's citizens. Ovid's reluctance to have his book defend itself here is linked to two larger themes in the exile poetry: first, the poet's private wrong against the *princeps* becomes a public crime in the

77 The sense of this distich is obvious but the text corrupt, and I've followed Wheeler and Goold 1988.

78 Cf. *Pont.* 4.14.41–42: *at malus interpres populi mihi concitat iram / inque nouum crimen carmina nostra uocat* "But a malicious agent stirs up the people's anger against me and invokes a new charge against my poetry."

eyes of the state, and second, he himself admits his guilt at having done wrong by the emperor because he is divine.[79]

Ovid's willingness to admit his guilt has direct bearing on the second part of Hall's query, namely that the word *crimina* implies a confession to wrongdoing the poet should not have wanted to make at the beginning of the work. Hall's point derives from a contingent problem mentioned above with regard to the textual criticism of this passage (and similar passages) whereby *carmina* is read instead of *crimina*. In neutral contexts, if they ever do exist, *carmina* means "songs" or "poetry," while *crimina* means "crimes" or "charges." The confusion here can be attributed to at least two interrelated sources: first, *carmen* is a considerably more common word in poetic contexts than *crimen* (especially in Ovid, the author of the *carmen perpetuum* [*Met.* 1.4]); second, and more important, *crimina* refers several times in the first two books of the *Tristia* to the writing of poetry, as in *Tr.* 1.7.21: *uel quod eram Musas, ut crimina nostra, perosus* "or the fact that I had come to hate the Muses as the source of the charges against me."[80] The two words are not synonyms but often carry a similar meaning, as in the case of the poet's famous account of the charges leveled against him, *duo crimina, carmen et error*: poetry is not only cause for a charge but also one of the crimes that sent Ovid into exile.

In light of the evidence presented thus far, I shall venture to propose that Ovid's identification of his *carmina* with *crimina* is intentional. It is in keeping with the very close attention the poet pays to the representation of his legal status in exile for him to point out here that

[79] Cf. Marache 1958, 412, 419; Veyne 1988, 175. In discussing the novel *Nazo Poeta* (1969) by the Polish writer Jacek Bochenski, which he calls a "skeptical tour de force," Ziolkowski 2005, 163, raises a fundamental question, "But since there was no crime, why did Ovid admit that he was guilty?" He gleans from the novel that "Ovid's guilt . . . consisted in his realization that, as a poet, he had an obligation to a truth higher than that of his own age—a truth that would live beyond the epochs." Ziolkowski then summarizes Bochenski's modern political (and religious) skepticism thus: "in his investigation of the deeper reasons for Ovid's sense of guilt, which he locates ultimately in the poet's vocation to a truth higher than ideology, he becomes an advocate for the power of poetry." Ziolkowski does not allow that Bochenski's skepticism is also Ovid's, who has seen through the emperor's religio-political façade of turning himself and his family into gods and, in paradoxical obstinacy, pays homage to a lie.

[80] See also *Tr.* 1.2.96; 2.3: *cur modo damnatas repeto, mea crimina, Musas*? "why do I return to the Muses, recently condemned, source of the charges against me?" 2.9 and 207; and perhaps *Tr.* 1.9.63–64: *ergo ut defendi nullo mea posse colore, / sic excusari crimina posse puto* "although my crimes are unable to be defended by any plea, I think they can be excused."

the writing of poetry has been turned into cause for criminal action under Augustus. The confusion between *carmina* and *crimina* among the manuscript copyists is thus understandable, and if editors were to adopt *carmina* for *crimina* here (*protinus admonitus repetet mea carmina lector* "once reminded the reader will recall my poems immediately"), the effect of the line would not change drastically. Yet the accepted reading of *crimina* is preferable because it jibes better with the language of the law court in the second half of the distich, *et peragar populi publicus ore reus*. Again, even here the word *crimina* involves *carmina*, and it is clear that the writing of poetry has led, at least in part, to Ovid becoming a public defendant.[81] Even Ovid's fictional muse can lay claim to the status of criminal defendant, *Tr.* 4.1.26: *cum mecum iuncti criminis acta rea est* [sc. *Musa*] "when my Muse was indicted with me for a crime we committed together."

Now the problem arises, as Hall notes, that the word *crimina* presupposes an admission of guilt that appears out of place in the first poem from exile. In the same poem, however, Ovid writes that his *Ars* deserved its punishment, 67–68:

> 'inspice' dic 'titulum: non sum praeceptor amoris;
> quas meruit poenas iam dedit illud opus'.

> Say, "look at the title: I'm no teacher of love; that work has paid the price that it deserved."

It is indeed curious that the poet admits to have done wrong in writing the *Ars* and that he considers it a just punishment to have had that work removed from the public libraries.[82] Yet the same idea resurfaces in the very the next poem, *Tr.* 1.2.95–96:

[81] Cf. Luck 1977, ad *Tr.* 1.1.23: "*mea crimina*: nicht nur das ungenannte Vergehen, auch die Tatsache, daß Ovid die Ars geschrieben hatte." Ovid equates his poetry with the Muses, who again are the reason for his downfall, *Tr.* 1.7.21; 2.3; 3.2.5–6; 3.7.9; 5.7.31–32; 5.12.45–46: *pace, nouem, uestra liceat dixisse, sorores: / uos estis nostrae maxima causa fugae* "with all due respect, nine sisters, let me state that you are the main reason for my exile." Cf. Marin 1958, 411.

[82] Against the admission of guilt, Luck 1977, ad *Tr.* 1.1.67f., notes "das ganze Buch II soll ja beweisen, dass die Ars nicht diese ungewöhnlich schwere Strafe verdient hätte," and adduces *Tr.* 2.493–494: *his ego deceptus non tristia carmina feci, / sed tristis nostros poena secuta iocos* "deceived by them, I wrote poems that were not bitter, but a bitter penalty has followed my light verses." There may also be generic games in play here, i.e. the lover's regret for wrongdoing against the beloved was a stock motif of Roman elegy, cf. Stroh 1971, 75, on *Pont.* 1.1.57–60.

et iubet et merui; nec, quae damnauerit ille,
crimina defendi fasque piumque puto.

He issues the decree I have deserved, and the crimes that he's condemned I don't think it right and proper to be defended.

Ovid's admission of guilt implicit in *crimina* at the opening of the *Tristia* initiates a *Leitmotiv*: regardless of the severity of his transgression, the poet does not deny that he is guilty and deserving of punishment.[83] Such a stance follows from a point made even earlier in the first poem, *Tr.* 1.1.20: *id quoque, quod uiuam, munus habere dei* "I consider it the gift of a god that I'm even alive." Ovid purports to owe his life to Augustus, the god, who had the power to kill but chose instead to spare him. Again, in the next poem, he acknowledges that the *princeps* as judge is the arbiter of his death, *Tr.* 1.2.64: *culpa mea est ipso iudice* [sc. Caesare] *morte minor* "my fault is unworthy of death in the eyes of the judge himself."[84] He later states that the greatest punishment, seemingly greater than exile itself, is the knowledge of having offended the *princeps*, *Tr.* 5.11.11–12:

maxima poena mihi est ipsum offendisse, priusque
uenisset mallem funeris hora mihi.

The greatest punishment for me is to have offended him, and I would have preferred that the hour of my death come before this.

In fact, in the first poem of the *Epistulae ex Ponto*, the pang of the guilt becomes greater than the pain of the punishment, *Pont.* 1.1.61–64:

---

[83] Thibault 1964, 117: "it is quite obvious that Ovid believes his punishment to be unmerited, although … he feels from time to time obliged to pretend that he deserved the punishment." Thibault's conclusion is sound, but his wording—"quite obvious" and "from time to time"—is too cavalier. In fact, it is clear that the poet consistently admits to have deserved his punishment, *Tr.* 2.29: *illa* [sc. ira Caesaris] *quidem iusta est, nec me meruisse negabo* "that anger of his is indeed just, and I shall not deny that I have deserved it;" 3.1.51–52: … *poenarum, quas se meruisse fatetur, / non facinus causam, sed suus error habet*; 5.5.63: *non mihi, qui poenam fateor meruisse* "he admits that he has deserved the punishment brought on not by a crime but by his own mistake;" *Pont.* 1.2.11–12: *qui, cum me poena dignum graviore fuisse / confitear, possum uix grauiora pati* "Though I admit that I have been deserving a more grievous penalty, I can scarcely suffer more grievous things." Of course, as exile wears on and Ovid's poetry becomes more eclectic in the *Epistulae ex Ponto*, "the exile's allusions to his 'error' and culpability decrease in frequency and vehemence," Claassen 1987, 32; cf. Claassen 1986, 63–65 (Table 1).

[84] Cf. *Pont.* 4.5.31–32: '*uiuit adhuc, uitamque tibi debere fatetur, / quam prius a miti Caesare munus habet*' "'he's still alive and admits to owe you his life, which he considers an earlier gift from a clement Caesar';" and *Tr.* 2.129–130; 4.4.45–46; 5.2.55; 5.4.21–22; 5.9.11; *Pont.* 4.15.3–4; the theme is called by Helzle, 1989, ad *Pont.* 4.5.31, the *debitor uitae*-motif, and cf. *ib.* ad *Pont.* 4.1.2.

cumque sit exilium, magis est mihi culpa dolori,
  estque pati poenam, quam meruisse, minus.
ut mihi di faueant, quibus est manifestior ipse,
  poena potest demi, culpa perennis erit.

Though exile is grievous to me, the guilt is moreso, and to suffer punishment is less than to have deserved it. Though I may be favored by the gods, than whom he is himself more manifest, the punishment can be removed, the guilt will last forever.

How are we to understand this admission of guilt? Can the poet be serious? For such an admission is surprising (and slightly confounding) in light of the evidence adduced above. There I hope to have demonstrated that Ovid consistently presents his *error* as a mild transgression that in normal circumstances would not have merited the punishment of exile and can only be understood as an extreme example of the willful exercise of power by a vengeful autocrat. Clearly, however, the circumstances of Ovid's banishment are far from normal, and the poet's professed guilt vis-à-vis his otherwise innocuous *error* has to be understood as part of the layered expression of his complex relationship to the emperor. In analyzing this relationship contemporary scholarship will often say that Ovid is being ironic—irony being the most powerful and pervasive weapon in the Ovidian arsenal as we know it today—so that when he says "guilty," he means in fact "innocent." This is also probably true in the present case, as indeed the majority of the evidence from above suggests. And yet the poet's position here conveys something notably more profound and more abject—in a word, *triste*—than the ridicule and contempt implicit in poetic irony.[85]

Perhaps the only fitting explanation for the contradictory way in which Ovid presents what he did ("it was a harmless mistake") and how he reacted to his punishment ("it was well deserved") is that it depends on Augustus' own paradoxical nature in the poetry of exile. There

[85] Miller 2004, 228–230 with nn. 42, 43, 51, offers an explanation in Lacanian terms: "what has not been fully appreciated in the previous criticism is the extent to which these two positions [*sc. the irony and flattery of Ovid's exile poetry*] are not contradictory but homologous: for each necessitates the thematizing of a moment of performative self-consciousness that exceeds the pure constative or observational content of even the truest factual statements. … His position is ironic, but that irony is not subversive per se—it is rather a recognition of the inherent power differentials in place. It is *sincerely ironic*. More precisely, while the poet may reserve a realm of internal freedom through poetic transcendence and a writing of the self … to serve as a locus of resistance, the very severance of that realm of freedom from the communal Symbolic, and its very ironic structure, renders it indistinguishable from complicity." (italics his)

the *princeps* is presented as both human and divine, at once the most exceptional man and the most powerful god. Thus the poet's submissive rhetorical stance, however unjustified or otherwise inexplicable in view of the attenuating circumstances he sets forth, may be understood as the ineluctable consequence of the emperor's all-powerful, godlike status from the very outset of these poems. For Ovid's admission of guilt stems from the "knowledge"—or cannily sustains the lie—that he committed a crime against a divine being whose clemency alone has allowed him to live. The poet is apparently being mordantly stubborn in following the perverse logic that a man who is destined to receive divine honors can actually behave like a god, like the vengeful and capricious gods of Greco-Roman myth, no less! Indeed, the passage from *Tr.* 5.11 quoted above appears to follow such logic and shows Ovid avowing that he would have preferred death to exile or any other punishment.[86] In fact, in the final poem of the collection Ovid intimates that he has only been left alive by the *princeps* in order to experience true suffering, *Pont.* 4.16.49–50: *tantummodo uita relicta est, / praebeat ut sensum materiamque mali* "life has been left to me only to offer the feeling and substance of suffering."

Summary

Ovid is the *poeta ludens* of Roman poetry and the bitter irony so crucial to the artistry of the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* leaves the emperor looking at times patently ridiculous, at other times worthy of the most severe condemnation. Thus it is not my intent to numb the bite of Ovid's wit by implying that we should be taking what he says in these passages at face value or as an expression of his true feelings. Yet there is a deeper, almost arresting truth to the suggestion that the mere knowledge of having done wrong is worse than any punishment a man can undergo, including a deathlike exile among barbarians on the edge of civilization.[87] To be sure, Ovid's admission of guilt in his first poem from exile poses a problem, but not the problem of self-sabotage that

[86] See also *Tr.* 3.3.33–34: *uel poena in tempus mortis dilata fuisset, / uel praecepisset mors properata fugam* "would that the penalty had been postponed to the hour of my death, or that my death had come before my exile;" 3.8.39–42.

[87] See Stahl 2002, 275–276, on the pervasiveness of fear in Roman daily life, or what he calls Augustus' "*fear factor.*" (italics his)

Professor Hall wants to have identified within a larger legal *apologia*. Rather, it raises a fundamental question about the nature of the *princeps*' power.[88] Augustus' power in the exile poetry derives, it seems, not from his right to punish the guilty, but from his ability to exact guilt from the accused: the accused is forced to admit guilt simply by virtue of having been accused.[89] This power, which is presented as the attribute of a mythical god, is the same power that exercises control over the legal proceedings at Rome so that Ovid's mistake (*error*) and act of writing (*carmen*) can be punished as severe criminal offenses. The poet makes this point neatly in a rhetorical question at *Pont.* 1.6.26: *omnis an in magnos culpa deos scelus est*? "is every fault against the great gods a serious criminal offense?" The relevance of this question depends again on Augustus' status as a god in the exile poetry, the subject of the next chapter.

---

[88] Nisbet 1982, 56: "[Ovid] gives an insight into the nature of power under the Principate which in spite of his necessary discretion is more revealing than anything in Virgil or Horace."

[89] Cf. *Pont.* 3.6.9–10: *huic ego, quam patior, nil possem demere poenae, / si iudex meriti cogerer esse mei* "I could remove nothing of this punishment I suffer even if forced to be the judge of my own deserts." The fiction of Hungarian emigré, Arthur Koestler, in *Darkness at Noon* (Germ. orig. *Sonnenfinsternis* 1940) offers a parallel in modern literature, and cf. Claassen 1999, 257, who cites Breyten Breytenbach's reflections from prison on punishment under a repressive regime in *True Confessions of an Albino Terrorist* (1985), "the dichotomy is 'guilt'/freedom. Where freedom does not exist, except as a subversive idea ... you are guilty even when you do not yet know of what."

CHAPTER THREE

GOD AND MAN: CAESAR AUGUSTUS IN OVID'S EXILIC MYTHOLOGY

> *imperii Roma deumque locus.*
>
> "Rome, home of empire and gods."
>
> *Tr.* 1.5.70

In the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* Ovid explores the nature of imperial power by investing his picture of the emperor with two distinct, though not mutually exclusive aspects: one mortal, the other divine.[1] In this chapter my analysis will focus primarily on the latter, in particular on the poet's treatment of Augustus as a god both by analogy to Jupiter, the most powerful divinity in the exile poetry, and in his own right as a Caesar destined for deification by senatorial decree. As the *Fasti* and *Metamorphoses* before them, the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* surpass the poems of Ovid's Augustan predecessors in referring to the *princeps* and his family as divine. This follows from an historical shift effected over the course of the first principate whereby reforms in religious practice gradually placed the figure of the *princeps* at the center of Roman religious discourse.[2] In Rome itself Augustus shied away from direct references to divinity during his lifetime and preferred allusions to a deification owed to him upon his death.[3] Outside the city, however, especially on the margins of the Roman world where Ovid spends his exile, the Caesars began to be worshipped as gods in an early form of the emperor cult.[4] This chapter investigates how the poet combines

---

[1] Gradel 2002, 32: "Beyond the force of tradition, power was in fact the only common determinant for according divine worship to anyone, celestials or terrestrials. The question whether the one or the other figure was a god or not was not important; ... It was any god's power and its relevance to worshippers which determined which deities would be cultivated, not their presumed divinity—or humanity."

[2] Beard-North-Price 1998, 1.169–170, 1.181–210; Galinsky 1996, 288; Gordon 1990; Beard 1987, 7; Fishwick 1987, 73–93; Liebeschuetz 1979, 61–90; Wissowa 1912, 73–78.

[3] Gradel 2002, 109, 265, and 198–212, on the gap between public propaganda and private practice; Weinstock 1971, 305, 408; Taylor 1931, 162–167; Wissowa 1912, 73.

[4] See Pippidi 1977, 250, on the evidence for a temple in Istria near Tomis dedicated

these newfound gods of the Roman state with the prominent figures of Greco-Roman myth to construct a unique, exilic mythology that aptly reflects both the political reality in Rome and the poet's personal experience on the margins of the empire in Tomis.[5]

Ovid's representation of his own wretched circumstances in exile stands in stark contrast to the prevailing image of the Caesars as powerful gods in these poems. The nearly pervasive presence of Augustus' divinity, for example, gives vivid expression to the difference in power between the *princeps* and the poet: the one's life is fully beholden to the other.[6] At least part of the *princeps*' divine status in the exile poetry is cast in terms of the political power he exercises at Rome, where the control he wields over the senate brings him the honorary titles *Augustus* and *pater patriae*. These titles lend a superhuman aura to the emperor's public persona and permit Ovid to define him more closely as a divinity of the *res publica* or *imperium Romanum*. The characteristic features of this newfound divinity are nevertheless drawn in relation to prominent mythical figures familiar from a long line of Greek and Roman poets going back to Homer. Scholars have noted, for example, that in the exile poetry Augustus is a god on earth with powers most like to Jupiter in heaven.[7] And like Jupiter, the *princeps* is often shown here as an angry god of retribution before whom the poet admits his guilt and promises repentance.[8] The complex picture of the *princeps*' divinity, a product both of honorary titles won from the senate and like representation of mythic gods in verse, illuminates a more general contrast on view in

to Augustus; cf. *ISM* I.146, and Wilkes 1996, 569. For the municipalities outside of Rome, cf. Gradel 2002, 73–108.

[5] The argument of this chapter is indebted in particular to Claassen 1999, 68–72; Williams 1994, 107–115 and 193–201, esp. 200. Claassen 1988 offers compelling comments on Ovidian poetics vis-à-vis myth, while Claassen 2001 provides a convenient list of all the mythical figures in the exile poetry. For the theoretical underpinning, I cleave closely to Viarre 1988 and 1991.

[6] E.g. *Tr.* 5.4.22: *denique quod uiuat, munus habere dei* "that he's even alive in the end, he holds to be a gift of a god [*sc. Augustus*];" and *Tr.* 1.1.20; 2.129–130; 4.4.45–46; 5.2.55; 5.9.11; *Pont.* 4.15.3–4; and Helzle, 1989, 43 and ad 4.1.2, on the *debitor uitae*-motif.

[7] Kenney 1982, 444, points out that Augustus is identified with Jupiter in no less than thirty of the fifty poems that make up *Tristia* 1, 3–5; cf. Claassen 2001, 36–39; Scott 1930, 52–58.

[8] Public confession of wrongdoing before a god was a convention of Greco-Roman poetry, cf. Veyne 1988, 175: "We know that … every impious person who repented had the duty of confessing his error and the divine punishment it had brought upon him. In that case, the turmoil of the soul took on an interest for others. It showed the power of the divinity, which puts a person outside himself."

these poems between political power and poetry's capacity to immortalize its subject. The immortalizing power of poetry deeply informs Ovid's representation of the emperor and his family and furnishes the poet with a means to reshape and, effectively, re-define the new gods of the city on poetic terms both in contemporary Rome and for posterity.

Princeps Divus

In referring to the *princeps* as divine, Ovid and the Augustan poets of the previous generation give voice to what must have been in the air at Rome.[9] Yet Ovid clearly exceeds his immediate predecessors by having Augustus and the imperial family appear in the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* as active and effective gods with the attendant powers of traditional deities of Greco-Roman myth.[10] For Vergil[11] and Horace,[12] by

[9] Scott 1930, 58; Kenney 1982, 445. Cf. *Met.* 15.746: *Caesar in urbe sua deus est* "Caesar is a god in his city." The divinization of the object of appeal is common in Roman elegy, and often the hard-hearted lover or *dura puella* becomes divine, a role apparently assumed by the stern Augustus in the exile poetry; cf. Stroh 1971, 25–23, 75–76.

[10] That is in 61 of 97, including *Ibis*. See Scott 1930, 43. Syme 1978, 166, issues a caveat on the language invoked to praise the ruler or his consort, "to catalogue or analyse would be tedious." Such a statement is odd coming from a prosopographer who analyzed catalogues to better result than most. The passages I have collected for analysis here supplement Scott 1930 on the emperor cult.

[11] Passages in Vergil where the divinity of Octavian / Augustus is implied or expressed include: *Ecl.* 1.6–8, 40–46; *G.* 1.24–42, a prayer to Caesar, esp. 40–42: *da facilem cursum atque audacibus adnue coeptis, / ignarosque uiae mecum miseratus agrestis / ingredere et uotis iam nunc adsuesce uocari* "grant safe passage and assent to bold undertakings, and having taken pity with me on farmers ignorant of the way begin and even now grow used to being invoked in prayer;" cf. 1.503–504 and 3.16: *in medio mihi Caesar erit templumque tenebit* "it will be Caesar, who will occupy the middle of my temple;" whether or not one has to be a god to have one's image set up in a temple, the passage still implies the deification of its subject, see Thomas 1988, 2.36–41; *A.* 1.286–288: *nascetur pulchra Troianus origine Caesar, / imperium Oceano, famam qui terminet astris, / Iulius, a magno demissum nomen Iulo* "a Caesar will be born from a noble line of Trojans, who will bound his empire with the Ocean and his fame with the stars, and his name will be Julius from great Iulus." On the way in which divinity is attained, see *A.* 9.641: *macte noua uirtute, puer, sic itur ad astra / dis genite et geniture deos* "increase in your newfound strength, child born from gods and destined to bear gods: for thus is the way to the stars." Of course, Ovid is not writing a national epic, though he has in common with Horace that he is responding to Vergil, on which see Rahn 1958, 107; Galinsky 1996, 228, 262–263; and Döpp 1968, 142 with n. 3.

[12] The passages in Horace where Augustus is likened to a god or the divinized heroes of Greek and Roman myth are numerous, e. g.: *Carm.* 1.2.41–52 (Mercury, on which see Fraenkel 1957, 247–251); and 1.12.49–60 (Jupiter); 3.3.9–12; 3.5.1–4; 3.14.1–4;

contrast, the divinity of the *princeps* is a matter of suggestion, something to be bestowed upon his death on the model of deified heroes of old such as Hercules and Romulus rather than the exaltation of a man to absolute divinity with the strength to rival (or even, outdo) the gods familiar from the literary tradition. Different, perhaps, is the case of Propertius, who refers to Augustus as *deus* in 3.4.1 and has the shade of the deceased Cornelia use the same word for him in the final poem of his collection.[13] At least in the latter passage, however, it ought to be noted that the dead are often afforded access to special knowledge in Greek and Latin poetry, such as Agamemnon in the underworld in Homer's *Odyssey* 11.440–461 or Anchises in *Aeneid* 6.756–892, and Cornelia's use of the word *deus* (4.11.60) probably portends the future deification of Augustus upon his death. Thus apart from a single reference to Augustus as a god in Propertius' third book, Ovid's practice of treating the emperor as divine sets him apart from his Augustan predecessors[14] and presents at least two problems for the modern reader. On the one hand, Ovidian excess in this regard belongs to the poetics of appeal for a reprieve from exile and no doubt represents an early stage in what later became the genre of panegyric poetry.[15] At the same time, it demonstrates that overt representation of the *princeps* as divine occurred also at Rome in his lifetime.[16] Ultimately, Ovid's tendency to

---

3.25.3–6; 4.2.37–39: *quo nihil maius meliusue terris / fata donauere bonique diui / nec dabunt* "than whom nothing greater or better have the fates and benevolent gods granted nor will ever grant to the earth;" 4.5 where we get perhaps the fullest treatment of Augustus' relation to the divine, in which Lowrie 1997, 335–336, reads "the insistence that Augustus is a son of gods … rather than a god himself;" *Ep.* 2.1, cf. Syme 1978, 176–177.

[13] Prop. 3.4.1: *Arma deus Caesar dites meditatur ad Indos* "divine Caesar contemplates war against rich India," and Cornelia's lament from the grave, 4.11.59–60: *ille sua nata dignam uixisse sororem / increpat et lacrimas uidimus ire deo* "he exclaims that in me has died a sister worthy of his daughter, and I've seen tears flow from the god," on which see Hutchinson 2006 ad loc. Other references to Augustus in Propertius: 2.1.25–26; 2.7.5: *magnus Caesar* "great Caesar;" 2.10 [a *laudatio* of Augustan victories as part of a metapoetic reflection on Propertius' position in relation to Vergil and Hesiod]; 3.11.66 [the challenge Augustus poses Jupiter]: *uix timeat saluo Caesare Roma Iouem* "scarcely would Rome fear Jupiter while Caesar lived."

[14] Manilius 1.9: *concessumque patri mundum deus ipse mereris* "and you—yourself a god—deserve the heavens granted to your father," is probably contemporaneous with Ovid's exile, if we accept the reference to the battle of the Teutoburg Forest in 9 AD (1.899–900) as a *terminus post quem*.

[15] Cf. Coleman 1988, 64, in her introduction to Stat. *Silv.* 4.1. On the question of prose panegyric of the emperor, see Braund 1998; Levene 1997.

[16] It is important to note with Gradel 2002, 109–111, that the imagery of Augustus

surpass his forebears in divinizing the emperor reflects the changing nature of the Augustan era of the principate from its early phase when Vergil, Horace, and Propertius were writing to its final phase and the composition of the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* in exile.[17]

In the exile poetry, Augustus is not simply a god among other gods but quite clearly the most powerful and pervasive divinity, and as such, he is again like Jupiter of traditional mythology.[18] Equating the *princeps* with the supreme god of the Greek and Roman pantheon was natural for Romans familiar with the practice of treating triumphant generals like "Jupiter for a day." In the late republic, for example, Sulla, Cicero, and Julius Caesar had been brought by varying degrees into association with Jupiter.[19] As Rome's protective divinity with a highly visible temple atop the Capitoline, Jupiter was the obvious choice as a parallel for three individuals singled out for having saved the city from danger.[20] Octavian too, before he became Rome's self-declared re-founder, was viewed first as the city's savior, and comparisons of him to Jupiter were widespread at Rome in the early days of his reign.[21] But Horace, who draws the parallel at least twice in his first collection of *Odes*, keeps a measured distance between the two: Augustus remains a powerful man on earth while Jupiter reigns supreme in heaven.[22] Thus Ovid's elevation of the *princeps* in his exile poetry to a Jupiter-like sky-god is out of step with the practice of his immediate predecessors. For in the transition from republic to principate, a transition that witnessed less

---

as a god in contemporary poetry such as Ovid's or in private iconography is different from legal deification or public worship within a state cult, which simply did not exist in Rome until *after* the death of the emperor.

[17] Cf. Syme 1978, 169–229; Jones 1960, 17.

[18] Kenney 1982, 444; Weinstock 1971, 305; Scott 1930, 52–58. Cf. Owen 1924, 63–81, whose arguments are partly based on the fragmentary evidence for a Gigantomachy; Williams 1994, 137–138, 172–173, and 190–193; and Bömer 1986, ad *Met.* 15.858: "Die Parallel- oder gar Gleichsetzung Iuppiter und Augustus ist für Ovid und auch für viele seiner Zeitgenossen beinahe selbstverständlich."

[19] Weinstock 1971, 302–305.

[20] Wissowa 1912, 164, 338.

[21] Still retained in Velleius Paterculus' *Compendium of Roman History* 2.89.1–2 (*pace* Woodman 1983, 250). Velleius' life (19 BC – 31 AD) and social position overlap notably with Ovid's insofar as both are *domi nobiles* and thus beneficiaries of the new Augustan order, on which see Millar 1993, 5–6.

[22] *Carm.* 1.12, 49–60; 3.5.1–4. In fact, in the former Weinstock 1971, 304, sees an acknowledgement of Jupiter's supremacy in response to exaggerated exaltation of Augustus as the supreme god of heaven.

the revival of the old than the introduction of the new,[23] the associations of the *princeps* with Jupiter begin to fade and are steadily displaced by connections with the cults of gods such as Apollo and Mars that had played an important role in the establishment of the Augustan regime.[24] As Rufus Fears has it, in the ideology of the first principate "Jupiter had no place … this role was reserved for Augustus."[25]

For this reason Ovid's collocation of Augustus with Jupiter so late in his period of rule is at odds with an imperial ideology that preferred more subtle allusions to a deification owed to him upon his death.[26] There is a disjunction between the historical *realia* in Rome, where the cult of Jupiter is in retreat and the *princeps* is never officially referred to as a god, and the poetic reality of Ovid's exile poetry, where Augustus as Jupiter occupies the most powerful position in the mythological framework. The power of Augustus as a god corresponds to the political power he exercises as Rome's first citizen. Combining these two forms of power—the one mortal, the other divine—is part of the poet's mode of appealing to the *princeps*: he flatters Augustus as an all-powerful ruler by using the obsequious language intrinsic to the art of the panegyrist and even showing himself to be a committed devotee of the ruler's newfound divinity (as it were, accepting his own representation at spurious face-value!). Not surprisingly, that divine status also extends over the whole of the imperial family, whom Ovid represents as gods in his poems from exile in order to complement the overwhelming, divine power of Augustus there.[27]

The *princeps* of course continues to attract most of Ovid's attention here, but other members of the imperial family appear often enough as gods in the exile poetry to merit some comment. The parallel between Augustus and Jupiter, for example, makes Livia like to Juno in *Pont.* 3.1.145: *uultum Iunonis*, and to both Juno and Venus earlier in the same poem, 117–118:

---

23 Wissowa 1912, 72: "die Reformen des Kaisers [bedeuteten] mehr einen Neubau als eine Wiederherstellung." For the argument of unity before division, see Galinsky 1996, 288–331.

24 See Wissowa 1912, 77–78, on the eclipse of the cult of Jupiter by the cult of Apollo under Augustus, and Latte 1960, 302–303 with n. 7.

25 Fears 1981, 63–64.

26 Gradel 2002, 109–115, 261–304.

27 Cf. Gaertner 2005, 13, on expressions of reverence and loyalty towards the divine emperor and his family.

quae Veneris formam, mores Iunonis habendo
  sola est caelesti digna reperta toro.

With Venus' beauty and Juno's character, she alone has been found worthy of the bed of a god of heaven.[28]

Given the emperor's widespread reputation as a philanderer (Suet. *Aug.* 69.1–2; Dio 54.16.3), the notion that Livia is the only possible complement to Augustus is surely ironic and may be meant as an insult rather than compliment.[29] In addition, the patent absurdity of such a line would have been obvious to Ovid's contemporaries because Augustus' first wife, Scribonia, was still alive and Livia's son, Tiberius, had in fact been fathered by Tiberius Claudius Nero.[30] Of course, this does nothing to prevent the poet from calling attention elsewhere to this rather uncomfortable fact. Thus in *Pont.* 2.8, both Livia and Tiberius stand as (carved) gods next to the divine Augustus, 1–4:

redditus est nobis Caesar cum Caesare nuper,
  quos mihi misisti, Maxime Cotta, deos;
utque tuum munus numerum, quem debet, haberet,
  est ibi Caesaribus Liuia iuncta suis.

---

[28] This passage (and poem) has been much discussed, e.g. Davisson 1984, 331–333; Colakis 1987, 213; Claassen 1987, 36–38; and Johnson 1997, 416–418, whose article provides the most thorough discussion of Ovid's often ambiguous treatment of the figure of Livia in the exile poetry. Livia's connection to Juno is of course already familiar from *Tr.* 2.161–164: *Liuia sic tecum sociales compleat annos / quae, nisi te, nullo coniuge digna fuit, / quae si non esset, caelebs te uita deceret, / nullaque, cui posses esse maritus, erat* "may Livia pass her years together with you: for she was worthy of no other husband but you, and if she had not lived, there would have been no one for you to marry and a celibate life would have suited you;" *Fast.* 1.649–650: *hanc tua constituit genetrix et rebus et ara, / sola toro magni digna reperta Iouis* "your mother established this goddess (Juno) both by her deeds and by an altar: she alone was found worthy of the bed of great Jove;" and *Fast.* 6.21–26. For Livia as Vesta, cf. *Pont.* 4.13.29–30: *esse pudicarum te Vestam, Liuia, matrum, / ambiguum nato dignior anne uiro* "… you, Livia, were the Vesta of chaste matrons, though I'm unsure whether more worthy of your son or husband." On Livia's role in public religious acts, see Fantham 2002a, 46; Johnson 1997, 410.

[29] Whether this reputation was actually deserved is not as important as that it was "widely discussed" and thus available for comment, as Johnson 1997, 419, points out. The same irony may lie behind Horace's *unico gaudens mulier marito* "rejoicing in the only husband fit for her to wed" (*Carm.* 3.14.5), so Wiedemann 1975, 269. Note too, with Gaertner 2005, 303 (ad *Pont.* 1.4.55), that *dignus* (118) is often ironic in Ovid; cf. Johnson 1997, 418 n. 52.

[30] For Ovid's place in the Scribonian-Claudian controversy in the later period of Augustus' reign, see Green 1982, 213–215, who believes that Ovid must have been privy to information within the Scribonian faction regarding a plot on Augustus' life and that this was the reason for his exile.

> I recently received the gods you sent me, Cotta Maximus: Caesar standing next to Caesar. And in order for your gift to have the proper number of three, Livia has been joined there to her Caesars.[31]

This poem contains the fullest (and most fulsome) treatment of the divinity of Augustus and his family, and I shall discuss it in greater detail below.[32] As for Tiberius and Livia, both appear as gods together again in what may be the latest poem of the exilic corpus, *Pont.* 4.9.107–108:

> stant pariter natusque pius coniunxque sacerdos,
> numina iam facto non leuiora deo.

> Next to one another stand his loyal son and priestess wife—no lesser deities than the one who's already been made into a god.

By this point in time (c. 15–16 AD), Augustus has died and been legally deified, and we might expect that as emperor himself Tiberius would essentially take over his predecessor's role in the exile poetry as the divine ruler of the Roman empire. Yet there are no direct references to Tiberius as a god in his own right here, and he is only ever brought into vague association with divinity while Augustus is still alive.[33] In fact, only as an official *Caesar*, or co-regent with Augustus, does Tiberius appear to attain what amounts to divine status as, for example, in *Pont.* 2.2.108: *curaque sit superis Caesaribusque tui* "may you, Messalinus, be a care to the gods above and to the Caesars."[34] Earlier in the same poem, it may be noted, the two younger *Caesares*, Drusus and Germanicus, are represented as Castor and Pollux, whose temple was conveniently

---

[31] There is some ambiguity about what form these *numina* take, 5–6: *argentum felix omnique beatius auro, / quod, fuerit pretium cum rude, numen habet* "O fortunate silver, more blessed than gold, though once unworked ore, now full of gods." Syme 1978, 167, thinks they are "statuettes" for Ovid's "domestic cult" described in *Pont.* 4.9.105–110; Helzle 2003, 359, speaks of a "silbernes Relief" or "kleine Büsten;" but Clauss 1999, 304, assumes (I think rightly) that Ovid is talking about images on coins, which he specifies as *denarii*, although Professor William Metcalf has suggested to me that the object Ovid describes may be a special-issue medallion in silver, slightly larger than an early imperial *aureus*, with a familiar image of the imperial family, father-mother-son. See also Gradel 2002, 202–203; Claassen 1999, 126 with n. 99; Galasso 1995, 343.

[32] E.g. *Pont.* 2.8.7–8, 15–16, 37–38, 51–52, 61–62, and see below 88–92.

[33] E.g. *Tr.* 1.2.104; 4.2.1, 8; *Pont.* 2.6.18; 4.15.3. Note, however, that in *Tr.* 2, Augustus shares his being with Tiberius, 173–176: *per quem bella geris, cuius nunc corpore pugnas, / auspicium cui das grande deosque tuos, / dimidioque tui praesens es et aspicis urbem, / dimidio procul es saeuaque bella geris* "through whom you wage war, with whose body you now do battle, to whom you give your high auspices and tutelary gods: with one half of yourself you stay home to look over the city; with the other half you wage savage wars far away;" cf. *Tr.* 2.229–230.

[34] Elsewhere in *Pont.* 1.4.55–56, on which below 103; and Helzle 2003, 154 ad loc.

situated next to the temple of the divine Julius in the forum, *Pont.* 2.2.83–84:

> fratribus adsimilis, quos proxima templa tenentis
> diuus ab excelsa Iulius aede uidet.

> Like the brothers in the temple next door upon whom the deified Julius looks down from his shrine on high.

Of course, the close connection between Germanicus and Drusus belonged to official imperial propaganda, as had also been the case earlier in the Augustan regime for the relationship between Gaius and Lucius.[35]

Especially important here—indeed in the later exilic poems generally—is the figure of Germanicus, who meant at least enough to receive the re-dedication of the *Fasti* from Ovid in exile.[36] It is thus no surprise that in the final book of the exile poetry he is likened on his own to Apollo, *Pont.* 4.8.75–78:

> utque nec ad citharam nec ad arcum segnis Apollo est,
> sed uenit ad sacras neruus uterque manus,
> sic tibi nec docti desunt nec principis artes
> mixta sed est animo cum Ioue Musa tuo.

> And just as Apollo is slow to neither cithara nor bow, but to his sacred hands come the chords of both, so do you possess the skills of both scholar and prince, and in your mind the Muse mingles with Jupiter.

The combination of the *artes principis* and *artes uatis*[37] represented in the figure of Germanicus is crucial for understanding the problem between

---

[35] Galasso 1995, 171; Helzle 2003, 286; both of whom cite Gelzer's article in *RE* X.451 s.v. "Iulius (Germanicus)" on the connection between Germanicus and Drusus.

[36] Herbert-Brown 1994, 173–185, 204–212; Fantham 1985, 244, 256–266, 272–273; Syme 1978, 21, 87–90, 156; cf. Evans 1983, 138–141, 159–160; Galasso 1995, 17–19. Germanicus is referred to as divine in Ovid's letter to his teacher Salanus, *Pont.* 2.5.47–54: *cum tu* [sc. Salane] *desisti mortaliaque ora quierunt / tectaque non longa conticuere mora, / surgit Iuleo iuuenis cognomine dignus, / qualis ab Eois Lucifer ortus aquis, / dumque silens adstat, status est uultusque diserti, / spemque decens doctae uocis amictus habet. / mox, ubi pulsa mora est atque os caeleste solutum, / hoc superos iures more solere loqui* "When you've finished and mortal lips have grown quiet, closed in silence for a short time, a young man worthy of the Iulean name arises like the morning star from eastern waters. While he stands in silence, his posture and look are those of an eloquent speaker, and his handsome robe holds out hope in a speech full of learning. Then when he's put aside delay and opened his heavenly mouth, you would swear that the gods above are wont to speak this way."

[37] Cf. *Pont.* 4.8.67–68: *non potes officium uatis contemnere uates: / iudicio pretium res habet ista tuo* "as a bard yourself, you cannot spurn the service of another bard: that thing has value in your judgment."

the political rule of the *princeps* in Rome and the mythical rule of the divine Augustus among the gods in heaven. The one, it seems, relies on the power invested in Roman *imperium*; the other depends on the tradition of poetry as a medium that transcends time.

That Ovid is fully intent on exploiting the transcendent quality of poetry in exile is most clear, again, from his representation of Augustus as Jupiter. A similar parallel was of course already familiar from the poetry of his immediate predecessors, Horace (*Carm.* 1.12; 3.5.1–4) and Propertius (3.11.55–56), and is also a feature of Ovid's own poetry prior to exile. In the *Fasti*, for example, he writes, 2.131–132:

> hoc tu per terras, quod in aethere Iuppiter alto,
> nomen habes: hominum tu pater, ille deum.

> You have the same name as Jupiter: he's the *father* of the gods in heaven, you're the *father* of men on earth.[38]

In Greek myth Zeus is traditionally the father of both gods and men as in the familiar Homeric formula πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε.[39] This formula is expressed variously at Rome by Ennius, *patrem diuumque hominumque* (592 Skutsch), and Vergil, *diuom pater atque hominum rex* (*A.* 1.65). In the above passage Ovid departs from Ennius and Vergil and separates the rule of Jupiter in heaven from the rule of Augustus on earth. In this he is most like Horace in the *Odes*, *Carm.* 1.12.49–52, 57–60:

> gentis humanae pater atque custos,
> orte Saturno, tibi cura magni
> Caesaris fatis data; tu secundo
> Caesare regnes…
>
> te minor laetum reget aequus orbem;
> tu graui curru quaties Olympum,
> tu parum castis inimica mittes
> fulmina lucis.

> Father and protector of the human race, son of Saturn, the fates have given you the care of great Caesar; may you reign with Caesar at your back ….

---

[38] Cf. *Fast.* 1.608: *hic* [Augustus] *socium summo cum Ioue nomen habet* "Augustus shares the name of god with Jupiter on high;" and further 1.650; 3.421–422. See Bömer 1958, ad loc., and *Ars* 1.204.

[39] E.g. *Il.* 1.544, *et passim*; Hes. *Theog.* 47: θεῶν πατέρ' ἠδὲ καὶ ἀνδρῶν "father of gods and men," 457, 468. Cf. Luck 1977, ad *Tr.* 2.37–38.

Lesser than you, he will rule justly over a flourishing world; you will continue to shake Olympus with your heavy chariot and send hostile blasts of lightning at the insufficiently pure.

For Horace the *princeps* is like Jupiter but still mortal, clearly lesser than the addressee of his prayer. In Ovid, however, both are gods and even share a name. The poet's use of the epithet *hominum pater* (132), moreover, consciously invokes the honorary title *pater patriae* bestowed on Augustus by senatorial decree in 2 BC.[40] That title itself alludes neatly to the ancient institution of the *paterfamilias* and the related term *parens patriae* bestowed at Rome first in the early fourth century on M. Furius Camillus (Liv. 5.49.7; 7.1.10) and nearly two centuries later on Q. Fabius Maximus "*Cunctator*." In the first century BC the terms *parens* and *pater* became interchangeable and were attached in turn to Marius, Sulla, Cicero, and Caesar, the latter two as *Vrbis custodes*.[41] Ovid refers to it again in another comparison of Augustus and Jupiter at the end of the *Metamorphoses*, 15.855–860:

sic magnus cedit titulis Agamemnonis Atreus,
Aegea sic Theseus, sic Pelea uicit Achilles,
denique, ut exemplis ipsos aequantibus utar,
sic et Saturnus minor est Ioue: Iuppiter arces
temperat aetherias et mundi regna triformis,
terra sub Augusto est; pater est et rector uterque.

So does great Atreus yield to the glory of Agamemnon; so did Theseus overcome Aegeus and Achilles, Peleus; and finally—to use a fitting comparison—even Saturn is less than Jupiter: Jupiter controls the citadel of heaven and rules over the three-formed universe, while earth lies under Augustus; they are both father and ruler.

The mythical *exempla* on view here, arranged in a catalogue of a familiar type from Ovid's earlier work and one met with greater frequency in the exile poetry,[42] peak in the image of Jupiter in heaven and Augustus on earth. The traditional title of the supreme god as father of both gods and men is split between Augustus' rule over men and Jupiter's rule over gods.[43]

---

[40] *Fast. Praen. CIL* I^2 233; Aug. RG 35; Suet. *Aug.* 58.1.

[41] *NP* 10.598 s.v. "*Pater patriae*" (M. Strothmann). Other references in the exile poetry to the title *pater patriae* are *Tr.* 2.181; 4.4.13; *Pont.* 1.1.36. Cf. Man. 1.7: *tu, Caesar, patriae princepsque paterque* "you, Caesar, the homeland's Father and First Citizen."

[42] E.g. *Am.* 1.1.7–16; 3.12.21–40; *Tr.* 1.2.5–10; 3.4a.19–30; 4.3.63–70; *Pont.* 4.8.51–64. On the catalogue in Ovid's exile poetry, see the useful study of Bernhardt 1986.

[43] See Feeney 1991, 210–224.

This dichotomy continues to inform Ovid's representation of the *princeps* and Jupiter in certain poems from the exile poetry. For example, in his open appeal to Augustus that forms the second book of the *Tristia* he writes, 37–40:

> iure igitur genitorque deum rectorque uocatur,
>   iure capax mundus nil Ioue maius habet.
> tu quoque, cum patriae rector dicare paterque,
>   utere more dei nomen habentis idem.
>
> Truly, then, is he called the father of the gods and their ruler; truly does the wide world hold nothing greater than Jupiter. You too, since you're now called your country's ruler and father, behave like the god whose name you share.

In contrast to *genitorque deum rectorque*, a long-established Latin version of a divine title going back to Homer and Hesiod, Augustus' *patriae rector paterque* derives from a relatively recent senatorial decree. While Jupiter takes his title and status as ruler of heaven from the most illustrious poets of the Greek and Roman literary tradition, Augustus appears to rely on the senate for relatively new titles to match the true basis of his power on earth, his legions.[44] In the above passage, Ovid exhorts Augustus to use the power implied by his quasi-legal titles to alleviate the punishment he has meted out as ruler of the Roman people. The mortal *princeps*, as arbiter of the law, is effectively asked to act like the Jupiter of myth in order to offer the poet the salvation traditionally bestowed by a god. Thus the two natures of the *princeps* as both man and god have been subtly, yet clearly brought into view in Ovid's open letter to the emperor from the early phase of his literary output in exile.

Ovid reflects upon this same duality later in a poem from the *Epistulae ex Ponto* addressed to Paullus Fabius Maximus,[45] *Pont.* 1.2.71–74:

---

[44] This is especially true of the title *Augustus*, conferred by senatorial decree in 27 BC, on which see below Ch. 4 103 and Jolowicz and Nicholas 1972, 343. On Augustus' power-base, see Jones 1970, 82; *ib.* 1960, 3–4, who notes that the military might of his legions required at least the façade of republican constitutional legitimacy to ensure the stability of his rule, and Nicholas 1962, 10: "The emperor's authority rested ultimately on the army and on the popular fear of what seemed the only alternative—a return to the disorder and civil war of the closing years of the Republic." For a different view, see Brunt and Moore 1967, 15. In relation to the exile poetry, see Wilkes 1996, 569: "Ovid's advertised feeling that his safety depended on the Roman general and his legions was no doubt heartfelt, and his private shrine to the imperial family was likely, in part at least, a compensation for his feeling of insecurity."

[45] The addressee of Horace *Carm.* 4.1. On Ovid's reminiscence of Horace's poem, see Kenney 1965b, 44–47.

nescit enim Caesar, quamuis deus omnia norit,
 ultimus hic qua sit condicione locus.
magna tenent illud rerum molimina numen:
 haec est caelesti pectore cura minor.

Caesar does not know—though a god knows everything—the condition of this place on the edge of the world. That divinity of his is occupied by matters of great importance: concern for this is too trifling for his heavenly mind.

In the same poem, Augustus is also a man, 87–88:

ira uiri mitis non me misisset in istam,
 si satis haec illi nota fuisset humus.

The wrath of a merciful man would not have sent me into such a land, if he had known at all what it was like.[46]

The ideas are then brought together at 115–118:

uox, precor, Augustas pro me tua molliat aures,
 auxilio trepidis quae solet esse reis,
adsuetaque tibi doctae dulcedine linguae
 aequandi superis pectora flecte uiri.

I pray, Maximus, that your voice, which often helps timid defendants, may soften Augustus' ears for me. With the customary sweetness of your learned tongue bring round the heart of a man destined to be made equal to the gods above.[47]

This poem's addressee, Paullus Fabius Maximus, was an accomplished lawyer and perhaps the most highly regarded political attaché in the Augustan court, and his exalted position in Rome is key to understanding the nuance of Ovid's representation of the *princeps* here.[48] For the

---

[46] Not surprisingly, several mss. give the variant *dei* for *uiri* in 87, see Richmond 1990 ad loc.; cf. Gaertner 2005, 190: "*ira uiri mitis* is oxymoronic … [the words *ira* and *mitis*] condense Ovid's ambivalent treatment to Augustus' claim to *clementia* in a single phrase."

[47] At the close of the poem Ovid asks Fabius to receive his wife because she honors the same gods and altars as he. Presumably, the poet is talking about a shrine of the Caesars in the Fabian household, 147–150: *confugit haec ad uos, uestras amplectitur aras / (iure uenit cultos ad sibi quisque deos) / flensque rogat, precibus lenito Caesare uestris / busta sui fiant ut propriora uiri* "she flees to you and embraces your altars (rightly does everyone turn to the gods he himself has worshipped), and in tears she asks that you soften Caesar with your prayers and that her husband's tomb be laid closer to home."

[48] Tac. *Ann.* 1.5; Helzle 2003, 75–76; and cf. Syme 1978, 151: "[D]eeper than anyone else in the counsels of Caesar," and 145 n. 3, where he reconsiders an idea of Kiessling from 1876 that Horace's ode was an epithalamium like the one Ovid professed to have composed, *Pont.* 1.2.131–136. On Ovid's wife's connection to the Fabian *gens*, see Helzle 1989a, 183–184, 189.

poet enlists Fabius to plead on his behalf in a way that is suitably politic by presenting a picture of Augustus that corresponds to the image of the idealized Roman statesman, at once mortal and divine.[49] The same may be said of two other passages from the *Tristia*, 2.55: [*iuro*] *hunc animum fauisse tibi, uir maxime* "I swear, my soul has favored you, greatest of men," and 4.8.52: [*moniti* ... *este*] *aequantem superos emeruisse uirum* "be forewarned to act deservingly on behalf of a man equal to the gods." In all of these passages, Ovid appears intent on sustaining the image of the *princeps* as an ideal (and predominantly Stoic) statesman by acknowledging a mortal aspect coexisting with the divine.

This notion is of course most familiar from the writings of Varro and Cicero,[50] and is probably suggested by Vergil at the outset of the *Georgics* (1.24–42). It also seems to lie behind the question that opened Horace's *Ode* quoted above, *Carm.* 1.12.1–2: *quem uirum aut heroa lyra uel acri / tibia sumis celebrare, Clio*? "What man or hero do you, Clio, propose to make famous with the lyre or high-pitched pipe?" Again, in *Odes* 3.5, as yet a man on earth Augustus serves as the counterpoise to Jupiter in heaven,[51] 1–4:

---

[49] Our best source is Cicero, e.g. of the divine Scipio in *Rep.* 6.13: *sed quo sis, Africane, alacrior ad tutandam rem publicam, sic habeto: omnibus qui patriam conseruauerint adiuuerint auxerint certum esse in caelo definitum locum, ubi beati aeuo sempiterno fruantur. nihil est enim illi principi deo qui omnem mundum regit, quod quidem in terris fiat, acceptius quam concilia coetusque hominum iure sociati; quae ciuitates appellantur harum rectores et conseruatores hinc profecti huc reuertuntur* "but in order that you, Africanus, may be more ready to defend the commonwealth, know that all those who have preserved, aided, or increased the homeland have a clearly fixed place in heaven, where they may enjoy eternal life in happiness. For there is nothing that happens on earth more welcome to that most eminent god who rules the whole world than the councils and assemblies of men joined in justice: the rulers and preservers of what we call "states" set out from and return to the same place;" *ib.* 6.19; cf. *Red. Sen.* 8: *princeps P. Lentulus, parens ac deus nostrae uitae fortunae memoriae nominis, hoc specimen uirtutis, hoc indicium animi, hoc lumen consulatus sui fore putatuit, si me mihi, si meis, si uobis, si r.p. reddidisset* "most important was P. Lentulus, father and divine protector of my life, fortune, memory, and name, who thought that if he returned me to myself, to my family, to you, and to the Roman people, this would mark a show of courage, a sign of affection, and an ornament for his consulship;" *Marc.* 8: *haec qui faciat non ego eum cum summis uiris comparo, sed simillimum deo iudico* "I do not compare the doer of such deeds to the best of men but judge him most like to a god;" and Varro *RD* fr. 20 Cardauns = August. *C.D.* 3.4; cf. Feeney 1991, 211.

[50] Above n. 49.

[51] Kiessling and Heinze 1964, ad loc: "Die parataktische Nebensetzung ... enthält keinen Gegensatz, sondern verkleidet einen Vergleichungssatz;" and Williams 1969, 57 n. 2: "Horace never speaks of Augustus as a god on earth, but either associates him with gods ... or speaks of his rule on earth as analogous to that of Jupiter in heaven."

Caelo tonantem credidimus Iouem
regnare: praesens diuus habebitur
Augustus adiectis Britannis
imperio gravibusque Persis.

We have come to believe that Jupiter is king in heaven when he thunders; Augustus will be considered a god among us when the Britons and vexatious Persians have been added to the empire.

The change here in verb-tense from perfect to future distinguishes the mythical god of the sky from the mortal extender of the Roman empire on earth. Augustus' grandeur is nowhere in doubt thanks to the grandeur of the Roman *Odes*—of which this is the fifth and penultimate—but the question of his divinity is left up to the future.[52] In a similar turn of phrase from the exile poetry Ovid nods to Horace but varies the parallel tellingly, *Tr.* 4.4.19–20:

causa tua exemplo superorum tuta duorum est,
quorum hic aspicitur, creditur ille deus.

Your case is safe on the example of two gods in heaven, of whom the former [Jupiter] is seen to be a god, the latter [Augustus] believed to be one.

These verbs are all present in tense so that, in contrast to Horace, Ovid has collapsed the time between traditional myth and present circumstances. The main difference between the gods here, however, depends on the one being "seen" and the other "believed;" and the poet may be suggesting that, while the divinity of Jupiter is visible to all, the divine power of Augustus is open to debate.[53] At the very least, Ovid has cannily inverted the Horatian aphorism by attaching the belief (*Carm.* 3.5.1: *credidimus*) to Augustus and making Jupiter the *diuus praesens* whose power is manifest (*aspicitur*).

Evidently, in both passages Horace and Ovid are drawing on the notion of the *deus praesens* or θεὸς ἐπιφανής, a common feature of Greco-Roman poetry from as early as Homer that took on particular

[52] Kiessling and Heinze 1964, ad loc: "der künftige Glaube an Augustus steht dem Dichter so sicher wie der uraltheilge an Juppiter." The *praesens diuus* here differs from the [*deus*] *praesens* in *Ep.* 2.1.15–17 (cited below), so Brink 1982, 52.

[53] Because of the problematic set of assumptions that come with the concept of belief in antiquity (see Gradel 2002, 71–72, 267–268; Price 1984a, 10–19), I have my reservations about taking the verb *credo* as "believe" but have decided to maintain this translation in both passages to point up the inherent irony in Ovid's inversion of the Horatian parallel.

importance in the Hellenistic period.[54] I shall discuss its significance to the exile poetry below and need only note now that Ovid may have replaced Augustus as *diuus praesens* in Horace with Jupiter as a manifest god precisely because Homer himself—the paradigmatic poet of the Greco-Roman literary tradition—had associated the father of the gods with the protection of exiles.[55] For clearly, the observable character of Jupiter's divinity in both Horace and Ovid relies on the history of the representation of myth in Greek and Latin literature as well as on a lengthy tradition of religious practice in the state cult. Augustus' divinity, by contrast, enjoys no such mythic stories or readily identifiable religious rites that could have been practiced and observed in public. Rather it rests entirely on honors to be won from the senate and amounts to what the poet himself later calls a god of the Roman state: *numen publicum* (*Pont.* 2.8.67). In the end, the question of "belief" is not in fact at issue here; the actual and inevitably more pressing problem is power.[56] For Ovid's analogy between Jupiter and Augustus throughout the exile poetry leaves no doubt that the *princeps*' power over the running of the state—the wars it fought, the gods it promoted, and the poets it exiled—was absolute. In fact, as the poet himself so grievously discovered, the emperor's will was law both at Rome and throughout the empire.

It is perhaps no coincidence, then, that Ovid writes such bold verses from the newly conquered north-eastern frontier of the Roman world among peoples whom the poet himself presents as the least obedient of imperial subjects.[57] Ironically, the worship of Augustus as an actual god appears already to have been in full swing in Tomis by the time of Ovid's exile.[58] The poet seemingly professes to make good on the belief

---

[54] *RE* Suppl. IV.277–323, esp. 310–318 (Pfister), and see below 85–92.

[55] Cf. *Il.* 24.527–534, where Zeus sends men hungry into exile, a passage analyzed in connection to the Zeus-Jupiter-Augustus analogy below Ch. 6 191.

[56] Cf. Gradel 2002, 32, on the question of divinity in the Roman emperor cult: "power was in fact the only common determinant for according divine worship to anyone, celestials or terrestrials... It was any god's power and its relevance to worshippers which determined which deities would be cultivated, not their presumed divinity—or humanity." Cf. *ib.* 26, for Gradel's understanding of divinity as a relative, rather than absolute category.

[57] E.g. *Pont.* 2.1.81–82: *maxima pars hominum nec te, pulcherrima, curat, / Roma, nec Ausonii militis arma timet* "most of these people neither care for you, o fairest Rome, nor fear the arms of Italy's soldiers;" *Tr.* 5.7.47–48: *non metuunt leges, sed cedit uiribus aequum, / uictaque pugnaci iura sub ense iacent* "they don't fear laws, but right yields to force, and justice lies conquered under the sword of the aggressor," on which see below Ch. 5 134.

[58] Pippidi 1977, 250, and above n. 4. Cf. Gaertner 2005, 12.

he mentions in *Tr.* 4.4.20 (*creditur ille*) by foisting provincial practice—whether welcome or not—upon the capital city, where the *princeps*' divinity was a matter of suggestion rather than public policy during his lifetime. Thus, although it was uncommon to ask for the emperor's intercession in times of distress,[59] Ovid nevertheless offers a prayer to Augustus as a god to save him from the ills of exile in the final distich of the poem under discussion, 87–88:

> o utinam uenti, quibus est ablatus Orestes,
> placato referant et mea uela deo.

> O with the god appeased, let the winds that brought Orestes away from Tauris bring back my sails too.

This passage emphasizes the emperor's divine nature and represents a slight change in Ovidian rhetorical practice from the *Fasti* and *Metamorphoses*. In the *Metamorphoses*, for example, Ovid prays to the ancient divinities of Rome at the close of the poem before the *sphragis*, thereby implying that Augustus will be able to confer divine favor only after he has died and acceded to heaven. Of course, the poet has to wish that this will happen after his own death, *Met.* 15.868–870:

> tarda sit illa dies et nostro serior aeuo,
> qua caput Augustum, quem temperat, orbe relicto
> accedat caelo faueatque precantibus absens.

> May that day come a long time from now and after I am dead, on which the life of Augustus, having left the world he governs, is added to heaven and in his absence from earth looks down favorably upon those praying to him.

In the exile poetry the god's day has come, as it were, so that the living emperor is represented as in the possession of divine powers that can be invoked (though probably not swayed!) by ritual supplication and prayer. Not surprisingly, Ovid asks for his favor in this life and signals his shift in attitude towards the divinity of Augustus by first quoting the above prayer from the *Metamorphoses* in *Tristia* 2.57: *optaui, peteres caelestia sidera tarde* "I've prayed that you'd join the heavenly stars late in life," then closing that poem with another appeal for a commutation of his place of exile, 573–577:

[59] Habicht 1973, 41; Gradel 2002, 213–233. On the prayer as a characteristic feature of the exile poetry, cf. Galasso 1995, 343–346, on *Pont.* 2.8.

his, precor, atque aliis possint tua numina flecti,
o pater, o patriae cura salusque tuae!
non ut in Ausoniam redeam, nisi forsitan olim,
cum longo poenae tempore uictus eris;
tutius exilium pauloque quietius oro,
ut par delicto sit mea poena suo.

By these and other prayers I beg that your divinity be pliable, o father, care and boon of your homeland! I pray not so much for a return to Italy—though perhaps I will, once you've been overcome by the length of my punishment—as for a slightly safer, more peaceful place of exile so that my punishment may fit the crime.

Here, the *princeps* is presented again as having in essence two natures, *pater patriae* and *numen caeleste*, which in turn provide the basis of Ovid's appeal to Augustus as both the mortal arbiter of Rome and its laws *and* the divine source of his salvation from exile.[60]

The change in the representation of the *princeps* from a Jupiter-like ruler on earth in the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* to a god in his own right with the power to save Ovid from exile arises of course from the different circumstances surrounding the composition of the poems themselves. It also points to a fundamental difference in their mythological make-up whereby Ovid takes the collocation of Augustus and Jupiter further in the exile poetry than in his earlier work. The two are no longer deities separated by the distance between heaven and earth; in the exile poetry, the *princeps* is put on par with Jupiter and often even replaces him to become the supreme god of what is in fact Ovid's unique, exilic mythology. This is clearly observable, for example, in the very first poem of the collection, *Tr.* 1.1.71–72:

ignoscant augusta mihi loca dique locorum.
uenit in hoc illa fulmen ab arce caput.

May those holy (Augustan) places and the gods they hold forgive me: from that citadel a thunderbolt struck my head;[61]

and is reiterated later in the same poem, *Tr.* 1.1.81–82:

---

[60] The idea of the poet's own salvation is prefigured in his address to Augustus as *salus patriae* at 574. In the same line, as shown in the passages cited by Bömer 1952, 328, *cura* represents Augustus in his role as protector of the city; cf. Verg. G. 1.26 and Fraenkel 1957, 297 n. 1.

[61] Drucker 1977, 45, on the thunderbolt as "Ausdruck des Zornes politischer Macht," citing Liv. 6.39.7 and the popular contemporary mime and writer of maxims, Publilius Syrus (*sent.* F 19): *fulmen est, ubi cum potestate habitat iracundia* "thunderbolts come from where anger lives with power."

me quoque, quae sensi, fateor Iouis arma timere:
 me reor infesto, cum tonat, igne peti.

I admit that I'm also afraid of Jupiter's arms, which I've actually felt: when it thunders, I feel as if I'm being attacked by enemy fire.

In the next poem, Augustus alone is referred to as a god who hardly needs the help of the gods of sky and sea to whom Ovid prays to stay the stormy waters, *Tr.* 1.2.59: *pro superi uiridesque dei, quibus aequora curae* "to the gods above and sea-green deities who rule the waters." The poet clarifies here the essential difference between the traditional gods of myth and the newly created gods of the Roman state, *Tr.* 1.2.65–66:

mittere me Stygias si iam uoluisset in undas
 Caesar, in hoc uestra non eguisset ope.

If he had wanted at any point to send me to the waters of the Styx, Caesar would not have needed your help in this.[62]

Caesar is understood to be as potent as Jupiter or rather the Zeus from the beginning of *Iliad* 8 (vv. 5–27) who is so much more powerful than the rest of the gods that he can suspend them together with the entire cosmos on a golden chain from Olympus. In demonstrating the power of the *princeps* over the traditional gods of (Greek) myth, the poet has also added to the depth of the analogy with Jupiter from the previous poem. Augustus and Jupiter are not simply alike, but in fact interchangeable within the mythological framework of these poems.[63]

To be sure, Ovid remains in constant dialogue with earlier Greek and Roman poets—especially Homer, the Alexandrians, and his immediate Augustan predecessors—while at the same time he needs to create a more expansive mythology for the exile poetry that subtly reshapes the literary tradition to accommodate Augustus, its newest "god." That

[62] Of course, Ovid claims to have been sent to the Styx later in *Pont.* 1.8.27–28: *ut careo uobis Stygias detrusus in oras, / quattuor autumnos Pleias orta fecit* "since I have been without you, driven down to the shores of the Styx, the Pleiades have risen to make the fourth autumn;" cf. *Tr.* 4.5.21–22, where the Styx becomes important to Ovid for his characterization of Tomis as a place of death, on which see Intro. n. 44.

[63] It goes without saying that Ovid constructs this mythological framework by imitating his predecessors, themselves in constant dialogue with the whole of the Greco-Roman literary tradition. Propertius, for example, refers to Augustus as the savior of the world by introducing a key figure from Rome's mythical past in Troy, 4.6.37–38: *mox ait 'o Longa mundi seruator ab Alba, / Auguste, Hectoreis cognite maior auis'* "Then he said, 'Alba Longa has brought you forth, Augustus, as savior of the world, known to be greater than those in Hector's line'."

god, whose anger is ultimately identified as the motivating force behind the poet's exile (not unlike Poseidon's anger in the *Odyssey* or Juno's in the *Aeneid*), seems to represent Ovid's only real chance for a reprieve from exile. This point is perhaps best illustrated on the basis of *Tristia* 3.8, which begins with a list of mythical *exempla* that culminates in the divine Augustus, 1–16:

> Nunc ego Triptolemi cuperem consistere curru,
>   misit in ignotam qui rude semen humum;
> nunc ego Medeae uellem frenare dracones,
>   quos habuit fugiens arce, Corinthe, tua;
> nunc ego iactandas optarem sumere pinnas,
>   siue tuas, Perseu, Daedale, siue tuas:
> ut tenera nostris cedente uolatibus aura
>   aspicerem patriae dulce repente solum,
> desertaeque domus uultum, memoresque sodales,
>   caraque praecipue coniugis ora meae.
> stulte, quid haec frustra uotis puerilibus optas,
>   quae non ulla tulit fertque feretque dies?
> si semel optandum est, Augusti numen adora,
>   et, quem sensisti, rite precare deum.
> ille tibi pinnasque potest currusque uolucres
>   tradere. det reditum, protinus ales eris.

> Now I'd love to stand in the chariot of Triptolemus, who planted untried seed in ground not worked before; now I'd like to bridle Medea's dragons, which she held when she fled your citadel, Corinth; now I wish I could propel myself through the air on wings like yours, Perseus, or yours, Daedalus. For while the gentle breeze tapers under my soaring flight I might suddenly catch sight of the homeland's sweet soil, the outside of the house I left, the friends still thinking of me, and—most of all—the face of my dear wife. Fool! Why do you wish vainly like a child and pray for what no day has brought, brings, or will bring? If you have but one chance to pray, worship Augustus' divinity, and rightly beseech the god whose power you've felt. He can give you wings and a chariot that flies: should he grant a return, you'll become a bird at once.

Ovid's metamorphosis into a bird in the last verse recalls the final poem in Horace's second book of *Odes*, 2.20. There the poet sprouts the wings of a swan, a symbol of poetic immortality, that give him the ability to travel in all directions to the outer reaches of the empire.[64] Where

[64] Cf. *Carm.* 2.20.1–5: *non usitata nec tenui ferar / penna biformis per liquidum aethera / uates, neque in terris morabor / longius inuidiaque maior / urbis relinquam* "I shall be borne on no ordinary or weak wing, a two-formed bard, nor shall I linger longer on earth, but greater than envy I shall quit the cities;" 13–20: *iam Daedaleo notior Icaro / uisam*

Horace goes out from Rome to the limits of the empire, it is Ovid's desire to come back to the city from a point on the margin of the civilized world. Horace's claim to immortality and to the freedom to go where he pleases depends only on the power invested in him as *uates* (3). Ovid's ability to fly, by contrast, depends on the fulfillment of his prayers to Augustus. Here, the *Augusti numen* (13) eclipses the need for all other prayers, as the entire divine framework has been built up to support it.

Indeed, the all-powerful, divine status of Augustus in the exile poetry is most frequently underscored in those instances in which Ovid beseeches the *princeps* for heavenly favor.[65] In *Tristia* 5.2, for example, the poet appeals to his wife to approach the emperor on his behalf and alludes to the emperor's widely publicized *clementia*, 35–36:

> ille deus, bene quo Romana potentia nixa est,
> saepe suo uictor lenis in hoste fuit

> That god, on whom the power of Rome has come to rest, has often been a mild victor towards his enemy.

Ovid emphasizes here the mild character of Augustus' divinity because he seeks to become another highly visible beneficiary of the emperor's vaunted clemency, a clemency now seeming to emanate from his dynamic status as a god. In fact, of all the gods in the exile poetry Augustus is depicted as the most manifest, *Pont.* 1.1.63: *ut mihi di faueant, quibus est manifestior ipse* "though I may be favored by the gods than whom he is himself more manifest," and most just, *Pont.* 1.2.97: *di faciant igitur, quorum iustissimus ipse est* "may it be done by the gods of whom he is himself the most just." In *Pont.* 1.4, moreover, Ovid refers to him together with his son and wife as *real* gods, 55–56:

---

gementis litora Bosphori / Syrtisque Gaetulas canorus / ales Hyperboreosque campos. / me Colchus et qui dissimulat metum / Marsae cohortis Dacus et ultimi / noscent Geloni, me † peritus † / discet Hiber Rhodanique potor "more well-known now than Daedalus' son Icarus, a song-filled bird, I shall visit the shores of the groaning Bosporus, the Gaetulian Syrtes, and the Hyperborean plains. The Colchian will know me, as will the Dacian who pretends not to fear the Marsian cohort and the Geloni at the ends of the earth; the Spaniard and drinker of the Rhone's water will learn about me."

65 E.g. *Tr.* 3.2.27–28: *di, quos experior nimium constanter iniquos, / participes irae quos deus unus habet* "O gods, I find you too often against me, you're kept by a single god as partners of his anger;" 4.1.53–54: ...*namque deorum / cetera cum magno Caesare turba facit* "for the rest of the gods act with Caesar;" *Ib.* 23–24: *Di melius! quorum longe mihi maximus ille est, / qui nostras inopes noluit esse uias* "Heaven forbid! For me he's by far the greatest god, who provided for my journey;" *Pont.* 3.3.68: [Amor loquens] *per matrem iuro Caesareumque caput* "I, Cupid, swear by my mother and the life of Caesar."

> turaque Caesaribus cum coniuge Caesare digna,
> dis ueris, memori debita ferre manu!
>
> And to offer with a mindful hand incense owed to the Caesars, real gods, together with a wife worthy of Caesar![66]

These passages show Ovid constructing an image of Augustus as a god that sits atop the exile poetry's mythological framework and gives metaphorical expression via myth to the political reality of the Roman empire and, by way of contrast, to the poet's own abject condition in exile.

Augustus deus praesens

Ovid's poetry of exile continues to engage with the power of that empire by sending poems back to its center, Rome, from a spot on its edge, Tomis. It may be true that exile makes Tomis the only place where Ovid can actually write these poems, but that they can still be read in Rome gives rise to the paradox of the punishment: the *princeps* requires Ovid's absence from the city by law, even as the poet recreates his own presence there through his poetry. It is a common human experience to realize that the voices of those absent—especially the beloved, but also the feared—can resonate even more powerfully than the voices of those whose physical presence is taken for granted. Surely, the disembodied voice of Ovid, Rome's most celebrated poet at the time of his banishment, resonated widely throughout the city where his exilic verses were available to be read, and it is a wonder the *princeps* ever allowed him to continue writing. Ovid's exilic voice is of course the same voice that will live on after he is dead if his claim to the immortality of his poetry has any validity. Yet even in the immediate, contemporary circumstances this voice also testifies to a poetic dynamism that resides in the paradoxical presence of absence. For Ovid's extended absence from Rome throws into high relief the overwhelming presence of the *princeps* there. Not surprisingly, in several instances he begs for a reprieve from the hardships of exile in Tomis by appealing to the *princeps* in the form of a *deus praesens*.[67]

[66] See Helzle 2003, 154 ad loc., for the translation of *di ueri*.

[67] Hardie 2002a, 9: "In the exile poetry the power of a *deus praesens*, and in particular of the imperial god-man, to save becomes an obsessive focus of attention. The poet's need for the emperor's saving presence has, as the other side of the coin, an awareness

Ovid's appeal to Augustus as a manifest god derives from the prevalence in classical (and biblical) literature of the ϑεὸς ἐπιφανής, an epithet given to gods and kings who had made their power manifest to their worshippers, which seems to have taken on special significance in the Hellenistic period.[68] Indeed, the notion of the *deus praesens* enjoyed prominent treatment in Greek poets such as Hesiod and Callimachus and was also known to Ovid from his immediate predecessors among the Augustan poets. In the first poem of his *Eclogues*, for example, Vergil depicts Octavian as a god, 1.6–8:

> o Meliboee, deus nobis haec otia fecit.
> namque erit ille mihi semper deus; illius aram
> saepe tener nostris ab ouilibus imbuet agnus.

> A god has created peace for us now, Meliboeus. That one will always be a god for me, and his altar will always be stained with the blood of the tender lamb from our folds.[69]

Because Octavian put an end to a protracted civil war and brought relative peace, Tityrus considers him a god, a view perhaps not uncommon for the character he is meant to portray: a country rustic in thrall to Rome. In a similar way, Ovid refers to Augustus as a god with the power to save him and restore the poet to Rome or at least to a place more peaceful than Tomis. Yet the emperor's ability to punish is also left to linger in the mind of the reader, as the exiled poet seeks refuge—Ulysses- or Telephus-like—at the altar of the very god who punished him, *Tr.* 5.2.35–36, 43–44:

> ille deus, bene quo Romana potentia nixa est,
> saepe suo uictor lenis in hoste fuit...

---

that the presence of the emperor may be reducible to mere images and shows. In exile, Ovid summons up their full spectacle of imperial power as consolation and potential source of salvation, but also reveals that the reality may be no more than the spectacle."

[68] *RE* Suppl. IV.310–318 (Pfister); Taylor 1931, 13, 22–23 on Alexander the Great; Weinstock 1971, 296–297 on Caesar; Brink 1982, ad Hor. *epist.* 2.1.15–17 on Augustus; cf. Price 1984a, 32, 36–40; Galasso 1995, 343–346.

[69] The word *deus* is rarely used of humans apart from ruler cult, see *TLL* V.1.890.42–891.78. Cf. Heckel 2003, 88 n. 64; Gradel 2002, 265; Price 1984b, on the terms *deus*, *divus*, and *theos* in the Roman imperial cult; and further Coleman 1977, 72, ad *Ecl.* 1.6: "deus and diuus were doublets. Servius' distinction (*A.* 5.45) between deos perpetuos and diuos ex hominibus factos is consistent with the use of diuus for Roman emperors. However he cites Varro and Ateius for the reverse meanings, and it is not clear whether Vergil is following Varro here or representing Tityrus as actually believing that his benefactor was a god incarnate."

uiderit ipse. sacram, quamuis inuisus, ad aram
confugiam: nullas summouet ara manus.[70]

That god, on whom the power of Rome has come to rest, has often been a mild victor towards his enemy ... He'll see for himself! Though I'm despised, I shall nevertheless seek refuge at his sacred altar: for his altar keeps off the hands of no one.[71]

That Ovid is even in need of saving is of course the result of Augustus' unduly harsh and, as it appears (cf. Ch. 2, 52), otherwise unwarranted punishment. On the surface, the poet praises the emperor by deifying him, only to suggest in between the lines that such newly acquired divine power can also be dangerous. He signals that danger by bringing attention to his own absence and reminds the reader again that he has been forced to leave the city by a power greater and more immediately visible than his own disembodied art. To be sure, his very movement—first, physically away from the city, then, back towards it via verse—appears to correspond to the dual nature of Augustus: as the mortal arbiter of the law at Rome he can punish Ovid by sending him away; as the divine savior of the empire he can also call him back. Of course, the complete picture is never so tidy as this, and clearly the *princeps*' "immortal" rage also led to the legal decision to exile the poet in the first place.[72] And yet there is something telling about the uneasy co-existence of the *princeps*' two natures in these poems: his mortal aspect, it seems, belongs to the physical world of human experience and is bound by time; his divinity, by contrast, resides within (and surely depends on) Ovid's poetic creation, which deems itself transcendent.

The ability of the *deus praesens* to offer salvation within the world of immediate experience is also important to Vergil, or rather Tityrus, who acknowledges that Octavian is a god because he delivered him from actual slavery, *Ecl.* 1.40–46:

[70] The text is Luck's 1967, who (1977, ad loc.) deems Ehwald's conjecture to *uideris* "unnötig," and while Hall's *ille* for *ipse* recalls v. 35, it is also unnecessary. In addition, with Luck (1977, 284) contra Owen, Ehwald, Wheeler and Goold, and Hall, I do not think the poem has to be divided from verse 45 on. There starts an extended apostrophe to Augustus, of which type the exile poetry offers several parallels, e.g. *Tr.* 5.11.23–30 to Augustus; *Pont.* 3.4.95–112 to Livia; 4.8.31–88 to Germanicus; and 4.9.105–134 to Tiberius.

[71] Cf. *Tr.* 2.181–186, 573–578; 3.12.53–54.

[72] On *ira* as Augustus' "hervorstechendster Zug," see Drucker 1977, 172; Syme 1978, 223, and more generally below Ch. 6 with nn. 66–68.

Quid facerem? neque seruitio me exire licebat
nec tam praesentis alibi cognoscere diuos.
hic illum uidi iuuenem, Meliboee, quotannis
bis senos cui nostra dies altaria fumant.
hic mihi responsum primus dedit ille petenti:
'pascite ut ante boues, pueri; summittite tauros.'

What could I have done? I was not allowed to leave from slavery, nor to come to know elsewhere gods so ready to help. I've seen him here, Meliboeus, the young man in whose honor our altars smoke twelve days of the year. When I asked, that one was the first here to give me a response: "Pasture the sheep as before, boys, and rear plough-oxen."

It is unlikely that Vergil's Italian shepherd is reproducing a practice of emperor worship current at Rome, although it is clear that the poet is playing upon the notion of the *deus praesens* as defined above.[73] Ovid does the same—or at least something very similar—in his appeals to Augustus, as at *Tr.* 2.53–54:

per mare, per terras, absentia numina, iuro,
per te praesentem conspicuumque deum

I swear by the unseen gods of the earth and sea, and by you, a present and manifest god.

The phrase, indeed the whole idea, conspicuously tweaked with typical Ovidian abundance in a tri-colon crescendo, recalls Horace's letter to Augustus, *Ep.* 2.1.15–17:

praesenti tibi maturos largimur honores
iurandasque tuum per numen ponimus aras,
nil oriturum alias, nil ortum tale fatentes.

We heap timely honors on you before us and set up altars to swear by your divinity, professing that absolutely nothing of the kind has come into being before or will do so at another time.

Both poets have in common the claim that Augustus has little time for reading poetry.[74] Yet the differences between these two letters are in fact

[73] Note, however, that Augustus received divine honors from the provinces (Appian *BC* 5.132) following his victory over Sextus Pompeius at Naulochus in 36, after which the poem seems to have been written, so Clausen 1994, 32 n. 15 and ad 1.43. See also Taylor 1931, 270–283, for a catalogue of "Inscriptions recording divine honors of Augustus and his house" drawn from the whole of the Roman empire, the earliest of which come from Greece (e.g. Thera, Thespiae) between 31–27 BC.

[74] Barchiesi 1993, 153. Cf. Hor. *Ep.* 2.1.3–4: *in publica commoda peccem, / si longo sermone morer tua tempora, Caesar* "I should sin against the common good, if I would delay your hours with long talk;" and Ov. *Tr.* 2.233–236: *urbs quoque te et legum lassat tutela tuarum / et*

more striking than the similarities; for each poet has a fundamentally different relationship with the *princeps* at the time of composition. On the one hand, Horace is a detached *arbiter artis*, in need of no help from Augustus who seems to have sought the poet's advice and is now getting the appropriate *sermo*. On the other, Ovid is a political exile, a casualty of his poetic *ingenium*, who has been forced to appeal to the clemency of the *princeps* to bring him back from Tomis. Even when both refer to Augustus as a *deus praesens* there is a significant distinction to be borne in mind. For Horace *praesens* means "present" in contrast to the heroes of the past (5–14: Romulus, Liber, Castor / Pollux, and Hercules) who can no longer stand before his eyes; because Augustus is still alive, he deserves to be treated *like* a god. Thus the manifest power of the *deus praesens* is palpable in Horace but not explicit. For the new and peculiar mythical structure of Ovid's exile poetry, however, Augustus *is* a god with the same powers as those invisible gods of the earth and sea by whom he swears in invoking the emperor's *numen*.[75] It is the *princeps*' manifest power of the traditional *deus praesens* that the poet calls upon in his oath above: he is not simply present, but also potent, and as in the case of the traditional gods of Greek and Roman myth, that potency can be both salutary and destructive.

Perhaps the most conspicuous example of the *deus praesens* in the exile poetry appears in a poem touched upon above, *Pont.* 2.8, which arises from Ovid's reflection on the images of the Caesarian triad—Augustus, Livia, and Tiberius—sent to him in Tomis by his friend Cotta Maximus.[76] There the poet writes, *Pont.* 2.8.9–10, 13–16:

---

morum, similes quos cupis esse tuis. / non tibi contingunt, quae gentibus otia praestas, / bellaque cum uitiis inrequieta geris "you're also wearied by the city and overseeing the laws you made and habits which you wish to be like your own; you don't enjoy the leisure you offer nations and you wage non-stop war with vice;" and 241–242: *illa quidem fateor frontis non esse seuerae / scripta, nec a tanto principe digna legi* "I readily admit that they are not the work of serious writer nor worthy to be read by so great a prince."

[75] But see Brink 1982, 53: "Ovid's poetry notoriously abounds with language adapted to emperor-worship and, on the other hand, often has *praesens* in its traditional use for established deities. He also applies *praesens*, only occasionally and in clever conceits, to Augustus and his house. But the time when *praesens deus* could express deliverance from great peril was past. Ovid's *phraseology* conveys something different." (emphasis his)

[76] Hardie 2002a, 318–322, esp. 321 on 2.8 as a "mimetic poem" in which the speaker documents his reaction to the changes taking place in his environment; cf. Albert 1988, 208–210. On the form of these gods—i.e. whether statues or images on a coin—see above n. 31.

est aliquid spectare deos et adesse putare,
  et quasi cum uero numine posse loqui . . . (9–10)
Caesareos uideo uultus, uelut ante uidebam:
  uix huius uoti spes fuit ulla mihi;
utque salutabam numen caeleste, saluto.
  quod reduci tribuas, nil, puto, maius habes. (13–16)

It is something to see gods and think that they are here and to be able to speak with them as if with actual divinity . . . Now I see the faces of the Caesars, as I used to before, though I hardly had any hope in the fulfillment of this prayer; and so as before, I greet that heavenly divinity. Even if you should arrange for my return, I think there's nothing greater you could give.

The appearance of the faces of the Caesars is presented as the answer to an earlier prayer (*uotum*), and the fulfillment of that *uotum* even outdoes the poet's desire to return from Tomis. Here again it is clear that alongside the perfunctory appeal for a reprieve or return—ostensibly the rationale behind these poems—Ovid offers a profound response to the changing state of affairs in Rome. In this case, the poet's wish for a return from exile becomes secondary to the arrival of the images of the Caesars as gods who have, in effect, brought Rome with them to Tomis, 19–20:

hunc ego cum spectem, uideor mihi cernere Romam,
  nam patriae faciem sustinet ille suae.

When I look upon him, I think I see Rome, for he preserves the image of his homeland.

In a sense the presence of Augustus signifies Rome—its coinage, its law, the extent of its territory, and even its religious make-up.[77] By the same token his absence will cheapen the city of Rome itself, as Ovid notes in the distich immediately preceding this one, 17–18:

quid nostris oculis nisi sola Palatia desunt?
  qui locus ablato Caesare uilis erit.

What do my eyes lack except the sight of the Palatine? That place will be worthless when Caesar has been taken away.

For Ovid, whose predicament in exile depends on his peculiar personal relationship to the *princeps*, Rome is barely Rome without Caesar. On one level, the poet bears witness here to the changing face(s) of the

[77] Miller 2004, 214–218, 234, where this distich is analyzed.

religion of the principate in which new gods have been added to the Roman pantheon and even established their presence on the outer reaches of the empire. On another level, he recognizes that whatever Rome has become under the *princeps*, the city as such cannot exist without him.

The arrival of the Caesars as *dei praesentes* in Tomis involves not only that Ovid recognize them as gods but also—as it were, paying credence to a poetic fiction of his own making—that he worship their divinity. The term *uotum* (51) itself implies worship, and a vague kind of ritual supplication plays out before the divinities that the poet imagines he sees.[78] This point is perhaps best illustrated by the slightly dreamy (and rather droll) way in which the poem closes, *Pont.* 2.8.51–76:

adnuite, o, timidis, mitissima numina, uotis:
  praesentis aliquid prosit habere deos.
Caesaris aduentu tuto gladiator harena
  exit et auxilium non leue uultus habet.
nos quoque uestra iuuat quod, qua licet, ora uidemus:
  intrata est superis quod domus una tribus.
felices illi, qui non simulcra, sed ipsos,
  quique deum coram corpora uera uident.
quod quoniam nobis inuidet inutile fatum,
  quos dedit ars, uultus effigiemque colo.
sic homines nouere deos, quos arduus aether
  occulit, et colitur pro Ioue forma Iouis.
denique, quae mecum est et erit sine fine, cauete
  ne sit in inuiso uestra figura loco.
nam caput hoc nostra citius ceruice recedet,
  et patiar fossis lumen abire genis,
quam caream raptis, o publica numina, uobis:
  uos eritis nostrae portus et ara fugae.
uos ego complectar, Geticis si cingar ab armis,
  utque meas aquilas, ut mea signa[79] sequar.
aut ego me fallo nimioque cupidine ludor,
  aut spes exilii commodioris adest.

[78] Galasso 1995, 346: "Lo schema cultuale a cui si può fare riferimento è quello del *Reihengebet* (= Fraenkel 1957, 247), in cui è invocata una serie di divinità … lo spunto offerto dall'invio dei busti consente di proporre una supplica articolata in tre parti che risponde meglio alla realtà del tardo principato augusteo, quando ormai sta per avvenire il passagio del potere a Tiberio, e Livia acquista un'importanza sempre maggiore."

[79] Korn's *ut mea signa* is an elegant solution for mss. confusion, see Richmond 1990, ad loc.

nam minus et minus est facies in imagine tristis,
uisaque sunt dictis adnuere ora meis.
uera, precor, fiant timidae praesagia mentis,
iustaque quamuis est sit minor ira dei.

O most lenient deities, grant the prayers I made in fear: may there be some advantage to have gods that are present. At the arrival of Caesar the gladiator leaves the arena in safety, for his face holds no slight source of aid. The sight of their faces helps me too—so far as is permitted—for three gods have entered a single house. Happy are they who look not on images but on the gods themselves and see the actual embodiment of gods before them. Because I've been denied that by hostile fate, I worship the images of faces made by art. Thus have men come to know gods, which the lofty heavens hide, and Jupiter's likeness is worshipped instead of Jupiter himself. See to it that this image, which I now have and always will without end, not lie in a hateful place. For I'd rather have my head cut off and allow my eye to be dug out of its socket, before I'd lack you, snatched away from me for good, o deities of the state: you will be the haven and altar of my exile. I shall embrace you, if I am surrounded by Getic arms, and I shall march behind you as my eagles and my standards. Either I'm mistaken and being duped by too much desire, or the hope of a more comfortable exile is at hand. For less and less does the image possess a sad mien, and the faces of the gods appear to assent to what I'm saying. I pray that the truth come from predictions of a timid mind and that the anger of the god, though just, become less severe.

The reverie that Ovid engages in here is overwrought, hardly sincere, and in fact quite humorous.[80] This does not, however, diminish the seriousness of the poet's point regarding the newfound gods the Caesars have become; for the fulfillment of his prayers for a commutation of exile depends on the saving act of the *dei praesentes* he has before him. The images of the imperial triad may look like those of the typical gods of Greek and Roman myth, especially as plastic representations (57: *simulacra*) that devotees tend to worship *in loco dei* (59–62), but they are in fact *publica numina* (67) or gods of the Roman state. At the same time they do not stand outside the larger mythological framework of these poems. Instead, Ovid has combined Rome's newly created gods with the traditional gods of the Greco-Roman pantheon to expand his mythical corpus to correspond to the peculiar circumstances of his exile. This point is most readily illustrated by the example of Augustus, the

[80] Claassen 1999, 126–129 with n. 99, discusses the humorous aspects of the poem, esp. 128–129: "an impression of irreverently bold ridicule throughout the poem is not eclipsed by the seriousness of its coda."

divine representation of the Roman state who also looks like Jupiter (60–62). The poet's apparent willingness to worship these new divinities, at once gods of the state *and* of myth, is clearly ironic and, at the same time, the natural result of Ovid's unique, exilic mythology. The logic behind that mythology, as well as the ostensible purpose for these poems' existence—a reprieve from exile or at least a commutation of his sentence—seems to push Ovid into becoming a devotee in an early, otherwise unattested form of the cult of the emperor. His devotion—so goes the logic—stems from his desire to propitiate the *princeps*' anger in the hopes of benefiting from an act of "divine" salvation (75–76).

It is worth asking here—where it is also convenient for recapitulating this chapter's argument—how Augustus ever became the "god" that can save Ovid from the ills of Tomis. On the one hand, Augustus' status as a god in the exile poetry derives from the political control he exercises at Rome and the honorary titles bestowed by the senate. As such his divinity is intimately tied to the state, a *numen publicum* according to Ovid (*Pont.* 2.8.67) and representative of a new phase in Roman religion that accompanies the establishment of the principate.[81] At the same time, Augustus' dominance of the mythological make-up of these poems is presented in terms of like references to the mythic gods recorded in the Greco-Roman literary tradition. He is at once a god of the newly reformed Roman state *and* a traditional god of Greek and Roman myth. In the end he is simply the most powerful divinity in the exile poetry, and it follows that (on the surface at least) Ovid shows himself a devotee of the divine emperor and depicts several instances of ritual supplication within his own literary version of the emperor's cult. The dynamics of this show of personal devotion, in particular the religious rites and devotional acts it occasions, will be the subject of the next chapter. In examining the exile poetry's representation of ritual activity within Ovid's "cult of the Caesars"—the first such representation in Latin literature—it will be possible to identify more clearly historical details such as sacred sites, ritual offerings, and votive prayers, or what amounts to the essence of religious worship in antiquity.

[81] Gradel 2002, 248, on the meaning of the word *numen* in reference to Hor. *Carm.* 4.5.31–36 and the so-called Tiberian addition to the *Fasti Praenestini*: "*numen* cult was merely a linguistic synonym for direct, godlike cult," which for Gradel could only have existed *after* the death of the emperor, for "such a state cult would have turned the Roman state into a full-blown divine monarchy."

CHAPTER FOUR

RELIGIOUS RITUAL AND POETIC DEVOTION: OVID'S REPRESENTATION OF RELIGION IN *TR.* AND *PONT.*

nec pietas ignota mea est: uidet hospita terra
in nostra sacrum Caesaris esse domo.

"My devotion's well-known: a foreign land sees
there's a shrine to Caesar in my house."

Pont. 4.9.105–106

This chapter addresses the extent to which the picture of Augustus as an actual god with divine powers, devoted worshippers, and his own sacred rites provides commentary on what historians of religion have recognized as the highly visible presence of the *princeps* at the center of the city's religious discourse.[1] To start, I shall consider the more general problem of "reading religion," that is, the difficulty of analyzing cult practice in literature. Then I shall attempt to situate the often slippery details of the poet's "devotion" to Augustus as the all-powerful god within their literary-historical context. The circumstances of Ovid's punishment make it hard to imagine such devotion as sincere, and it is perhaps best understood as the natural result of the poet accepting at spurious face-value the very deities he himself creates. The presumptive rites of these gods within Ovid's literary prototype of the emperor-cult are clearly distinguished from the sacred rites of the poets, a distinction the poet brings into vivid focus in *Pont.* 4.8. The conclusion here will offer an interpretation of this poem against the theoretical background of the *theologia tripertita*—a tripartite division of the gods among poets, priests, and philosophers—found in Varro's *Res Diuinae*.[2]

---

[1] Beard, North, and Price 1998, 1.169–170, 1.181–210; Galinsky 1996, 288; Gordon 1990; Beard 1987, 7, on the calendar; Fishwick 1987, 73–93; Liebeschuetz 1979, 61–90; Wissowa 1912, 73–78.

[2] The three theologies may be original to Varro, so Rüpke 2005, 107–118, whose arguments nevertheless do not refute Lieberg's influential article on the theoretical origins of the *theologia tripertita* in an earlier Greek (perhaps Stoic) source, e.g. Lieberg 1973, 106–107.

Reading Religion

To say the problem of reading religion in Ovid is vexed is to understate the case. Both religion and poetry involve politics at Rome, and all three must first be filtered through a lengthy and disputed history, itself made more remote by the difficulty of understanding sources in ancient Greek and Latin.[3] Yet the vagaries of history have made Ovid, of all Latin poets, the most authoritative voice on Roman ritual practice by preserving for us his aetiological exploration of the annual calendar, the *Fasti*. In its present form, the poem covers only the months of January through June because, as we read in the *Tristia* (2.549–552), Ovid had apparently completed for publication only the first half of the calendar year when he was suddenly exiled in 8 AD.[4] Still, the poem remains our singlemost important literary source for Roman religion, even if the poet "was both selective and inventive in his presentation of deities and their cult."[5] Even before the *Fasti*, however, the poetic representation of the *realia* of religious ritual may have appealed to Ovid's intellectual curiosity, and indeed a famous passage from the *Ars* appears to provide us with some evidence on the matter, 1.637–638:

> expedit esse deos et, ut expedit, esse putemus:
> dentur in antiquos tura merumque focos.

> It is useful that gods exist, and as it is useful, let us think that they do: let there be offered incense and wine at ancient hearths.

The word-repetition, assonance, and alliteration of labials and dentals in the hexameter together with the pentameter's homoioteleuton at the central caesura and verse-end contribute to the aphoristic quality of the distich. Its spirit is funny and light, in keeping with a passage (631–658)—and a poem—that recalls Jupiter's trysts and prevarications to exonerate men's deception of women for sex. But what can these two lines tell us about the concept of divinity in Ovid? or the significance of ritual to his poetry?[6]

---

[3] Cf. Gradel 2002, 27–28.

[4] It is possible, and perhaps likely, that Ovid never intended to cover the second half of the year, thus avoiding the emperor's months of *Iulius* and *Augustus*, on which see Fantham 1998, 2–3.

[5] Fantham 1998, 31, and 32–35, for a concise overview of Ovid's treatment of *sacra* (religious rites) in *Fast*.

[6] Cf. Boyle 1997, 8, on this distich in relation to the *Fasti*, "Ovid's poem on *tempora, arae, sacra*, and religious festivals." Kennedy 1992, 45, interprets the passage in relation to the Augustan discourse: "Even those like Ovid, who might arguably have

A related idea on the usefulness of the gods appears in a passage from Varro's *Res Diuinae*, dedicated in around 47 BC to the *pontifex maximus*, Julius Caesar:[7]

> utile esse ciuitatibus … ut se uiri fortes, etiamsi falsum sit, diis genitos esse credant, ut eo modo animus humanus uelut diuinae stirpis fiduciam gerens res magnas adgrediendas praesumat audacius, agat uehementius et ob hoc impleat ipsa securitate felicius. (Cardauns *RD* fr. 20 = August. *C.D.* 3.4)
>
> It is useful to city-states, even if it is false, that brave men think they have been born from gods. For the human spirit, believing that it is of divine origin, will be more daring in undertaking great things, more energetic in doing them, and by its very freedom from care more successful in carrying them out.

While it is clear that Varro's concern here with the theoretical connection between great men and gods is different from Ovid's playful irreverence regarding ritual practice, both passages nevertheless conceptualize divinity in terms of its utility: one for the benefit of running of states; the other for shows of devotion to deceive (deceptive) women. In fact, it might be said that in the light of Varro's words—whether Ovid knew them or not—the distich from the *Ars* offers a polished display of wit that converges elegantly with a notion common to Roman philosophical thought.[8] In addition, these two lines capture neatly what are traditionally considered the constituent elements of ancient religion: myth and ritual. The *dei* Ovid speaks of derive from the tradition of Greek literature and had long become part of the store of Roman myth; the

---

wished to distance themselves from the actions of Augustus, are nonetheless unable to escape from this discourse, and could be seen as contributing to its consequences … Ovid's statement, although rhetorically resisting its own implication in this logic of explanation, cannot be exempted from its effects, for Ovid's ironic and flippant appropriation is part of what gives this logic its social meaning and force, and so helps to render legitimate the moral and religious programme of Augustus. This is the discursive context which both enables the Ars Amatoria as witty and sophisticated text *and* constitutes it at the same time as what-must-be-repressed. This is the logic that helps to generate the 'necessity' of an 'Augustus', and thus plays an integral part in creating and sustaining the position of Augustus." (italics his) Miller 2004, 210–236, reaches a similar conclusion in his Lacanian reading of the exile poetry.

[7] Attested twice: Lact. *Inst.* 1.6.7; August. *C.D.* 7.35. The initial publication is generally agreed to postdate the battle of Pharsalia, probably in 47, so Cardauns 1976 vol. 2, 132; Lehmann 1997, 168. But Horsfall 1972, 120–122, argues for a date of 46, followed also by Tarver 1996, 42–43. Jocelyn 1982 wants a date in the mid-50s.

[8] Ovid most likely knew Varro's work well, so Merkel 1841, cvi; Latte 1960, 6 with n. 2; Graf 1988, 68; Green 2002. Cf. Syme 1978, 105, on *Ars* 1.637: "[Ovid] shared the opinions of the educated class."

ritual comes from common practice in cult in the Roman world.[9] The representation of the gods of myth and the ritual practice in their cult here is exemplary and allows the poet to compose a didactic poem in the spirit of his Alexandrian predecessors and the context of Roman love elegy.

Yet it is perhaps misguided to subjugate the representation of myth and cult practice to literary motives. Denis Feeney has argued that myth, ritual, and literature are all determinant aspects of religion at Rome, and any attempt to disengage myth and cult from the literary context in which they appear denies the validity of one of several components in the religious make-up of Roman culture.[10] A categorically restrictive approach, Feeney argues, can lead to misunderstanding when reading highly literary texts on important religious documents. A case in point is the *Fasti*, again our richest source for ritual practice within Roman religion, which Ovid's contemporaries had myriad reasons for reading (or not)—social conformity, scholarly curiosity, pure pleasure. There can be no doubt, however, that the poem contributed to the ways in which the city's educated populace determined what significance (if any) the calendar had for them.[11] Even now, it continues to shape how we think about Roman religion and its representation in literature. Recent work on the interplay of myth and cult in both the *Fasti* and *Metamorphoses* invites similar investigation into the exile poetry.[12] An analysis of religious ritual in the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* is especially welcome because these poems provide the first representation in Latin literature of worship—albeit poetically reconstructed and highly personal—within what amounts to a literary prototype of the imperial cult, the latest and most significant development in the history of Roman religion.[13]

---

[9] On the wine and incense in *Ars* 1.638, see Wissowa 1912, 412.

[10] Feeney 1998, 137.

[11] Boyle 1997, 24: "Roman religion served to integrate liminal situations of human life into societal knowledge, the imperial restructuring of that knowledge to maintain personal hegemony and control is the subject of Ovid's *Fasti*."

[12] On *Fast.*: Scheid 1992; Newlands 1995; Boyle 1997; Fantham 2002a; ib. 2002b; Green 2002; on *Met.*: Graf 1988; 1994; Feeney 1991.

[13] I agree with Heckel 2003, 73, who cautions against using Ovid's poetry as a source for the imperial cult as in Scott 1930. And yet Gradel 2002, 198–212 (esp. 202–203, where he treats Ovid's exile poetry), shows that "private" worship was an important element in the early development of the "public" imperial cult, especially in its inchoate form under Augustus. Thus even if Ovid is not earnest, he may be reproducing actual

Ovid's poems from exile document what is in fact a dramatic change in the religious make-up of Roman culture under Augustus, a change that corresponds rather patly in history to the political shift from republic to principate. The refashioned religion of the early imperial period witnessed above all the penetration of the *princeps* into nearly every facet of the ritual process.[14] There was no extended tradition of myth, however, surrounding the worship of an individual ruler at Rome.[15] Julius Caesar and Romans of other noble families could cobble together ancestral histories with divine origins, and it would be unwise to discount the suggestive power of such associations with myth in the public sphere. Yet the course of Roman history saw to it that there could not have been any traditional tales of forgotten origin about a religious phenomenon now considered to have been adopted in large part from an alien tradition of emperor worship in the Hellenistic East.[16] In a sense, Vergil sought to remedy this situation by uniting in poetry the myth of the founding of Rome with Augustus' re-founding of the republic. The success of the *Aeneid*, as for example the images of Aeneas and Augustus together on the *ara pacis* show, is testimony to the very intimate relationship between religion and poetry at Rome. The aetiologies that Vergil offers for Roman religious practice in cult, for example in *Aeneid* 8, show the poet participating in the emperor's attempts to refocus the religious discourse of the city and concentrate its ritual activity around himself. At the same time, myth allows Vergil to remove the story of actual events from an historical to a poetic level so that his commentary on Augustan Rome remains, for the most part, analogical.[17] Ovid too transfers the story of his exile from an historical to a poetic level even as his poems remain grounded in the actual events he represents

---

practice, so Drucker 1977, 11–14, who sees the poet as an ironical worshipper of the emperor.

[14] Beard, North, and Price 1998, 1.169–170, 1.206–210; Gordon 1990; Beard 1987; Liebeschuetz 1979, 62–89; Wissowa 1912, 73–78.

[15] This is not to say that there were no "myths" at Rome, an older, Romantic opinion of historians of religion in thrall to the Greek paradigm; see Graf 1993, 25–27, 43, for an overview of the problem of the so-called "Mythenlosigkeit der Römer;" *ib.* 1–5, from his "Einleitung;" and more recently Ando 2003, 101–105.

[16] On the Hellenistic origins of the Roman imperial cult, cf. Fishwick 1987, 3–55; Price 1984a, 23–76; Taylor 1931, 1–34. For a corrective challenge to this view, cf. Gradel 2002, Ch. 2 "Before the Caesars."

[17] The appearances of Marcellus in the underworld in Book 6 and Augustus at the battle of Actium on Aeneas' shield in Book 8 are famous exceptions: here the contemporary Roman world has intruded upon the world of myth.

himself as having personally experienced. The following analysis builds on the results of last chapter's investigation into Ovid's exilic mythologizing and focuses in particular on emperor worship in order to pursue recent scholarship that explores the relationship of literature to religion and *vice versa*.[18]

The cult of the Caesars

A full examination of the historical roots of emperor worship at Rome lies outside the scope of this study.[19] At the same time, it is clear that Ovid's representation of the worship of the Caesars in the exile poetry draws on a tradition of related representations going back to cult's eponymous founder, Julius Caesar.[20] Stefan Weinstock provides a close look at Caesar's program for his own deification and Augustus' point of departure in establishing the principate.[21] Weinstock follows Plutarch's claim that Caesar wanted to be recognized in his lifetime as a god in Rome based on the model of Hellenistic kings.[22] In this the future *dictator* was guided by the historical tradition in incorporating

---

[18] Especially Feeney 1998, but see also Graf 2002, and Rives 1998, 358.

[19] For the origins of the emperor cult at Rome, see Gradel 2002, 27–72, which treats divinity as a "relative" instead of "absolute" category and focuses in particular on status over a strict divide between man and god, thus attempting to correct arguments found in earlier scholarship. Cf. Clauss 1999, 41–53; Fishwick 1987, 46–93; Weinstock 1971, 288–289; Taylor 1931, 35–180; Wissowa 1912, 73, 342.

[20] On the emperor cult in Ovid's poetry, Gaertner 2005, 12–14; Gradel 2002, 202–203; Clauss 1999, 71, 304. See also Drucker 1977, 11–14, and the useful study of Scott 1930; and cf. Beard, North, and Price 1998, 1.318: "there was no such thing as '*the* imperial cult'; rather there was a series of different cults sharing a common focus in the worship of the emperor, his family or predecessors, but ... operating quite differently according to a variety of different local circumstances." (emphasis theirs) Nock 1934, 481–482, interpreted the emperor cult as "homage" not "worship," which has since been recast among contemporary scholars as the distinction between "politics" and "religion," e.g. Syme 1978, 167: "In general terms, the cult of the Caesars is worship of power ... it cannot have had much emotional content ... Forms and words had nothing to do with inner beliefs." But Price 1984a, 15–19, and Gradel 2002, *passim*, have argued for an approach to understanding the imperial cult that eschews such neat (and in fact Christianized) distinctions in favor of mediating between politics and religion, practice and emotion, status and symbol, and homage and worship.

[21] Weinstock 1971, 3, and Ch. xviii 383–410, on "The Cult." In his Epilogue, 411–414, Weinstock asserts that he is following a view implicit in Mommsen's *Römisches Staatsrecht* that Caesar was the founder of the empire. For Galinsky 1996, 291, he overstates his case. Cf. Fishwick 1987, 72.

[22] Plu. *Jul.* 28, 50–51.

Greek notions on divinity into ideas about Rome's heroic past. Of course, Roman generals had been receiving divine honors as early as the late third century BC.[23] The difference in Caesar's case was in the duration: the divine status accorded to men for outstanding deeds in their lifetime usually ended upon their death; Caesar wanted to become a god for good.[24] It seems that his intention to do so on the basis of the divine lineage of the *Iulii* was already in evidence from as early as the year 69 BC, when he stressed his aunt's descent from kings and gods at her funeral.[25] By pointing to his family's descent from Venus there, he effectively introduced a powerful tool for political propaganda in his lifetime.[26] Upon his assassination in 44 BC the Roman people established a cult to his divinity which was consecrated by senatorial decree two years later.[27] Two years after that, in 40, Mark Antony was inaugurated, at Octavian's behest, as *flamen* in the cult of *diuus Iulius* and began work on a temple around 36.[28] Octavian, who had taken to calling himself *filius diui Iulii* after the peace of Brundisium in 40, completed that temple himself and dedicated it in 29 immediately following his triple triumph.

After Actium, however, and the process of appeasement attendant in the formal re-establishment of the *res publica*, Octavian—the new *princeps* and not yet Augustus—shied away from associations with Julius Caesar and with divinity in his lifetime. Outside Rome, according to Appian, Augustus was receiving divine honors from the provinces as

---

[23] E.g. Marcus Claudius Marcellus in 212 BC at Syracuse, cf. Taylor 1931, 35; Weinstock 1971, 288–289. We should also remember (so Wiedemann 1975, 268 n. 7) that epigraphical evidence, according to Bowersock 1965, 119, shows that proconsuls were still receiving divine honors in their own provinces as late as 8 AD, and that only in 11 AD did Augustus fully monopolize them (Dio 56.25.6).

[24] Weinstock 1971, 3, 286, 412.

[25] Suet. *Iul.* 6.1–2.

[26] Most clearly expressed in the temple of *Venus Genetrix* in Caesar's forum, see Wissowa 1912, 77–78.

[27] Wissowa 1912, 342 with nn. 6–7, citing Dio 47.18.4 and *CIL* IX 2628. The matter is controversial, and for the statements above I follow Weinstock, 364–368, 385–391. For a contrary view see Galinsky 1996, 301. On the clearest indication of his divinity from the *pompa circensis* (procession at the Circus), see Dio 47.19.2 and Suet. *Claud.* 11.2.

[28] Weinstock 1971, 307, 399, and see 391, where he notes that the name *diuus Iulius* was not coined by the Senate in 42, but is already attested (with bitter sarcasm) in September 44 in Cicero's "golden" *Philippic*, 2.110: *est ergo flamen, ut Ioui, ut Marti, ut Quirino, sic diuo Iulio M. Antonius* "just as Jupiter, Mars, and Quirinus have priests, so is Antony the priest of the deified Julius;" and see Ramsey 2003, 323 ad loc.; Gradel 2002, 55–56, 69–72; Beard, North, and Price 1998, 2.222–223.

early as 36 BC after his victory over Sextus Pompeius at Naulochus.[29] Within the city, however, his status as a god in Roman ritual practice was left intentionally ambiguous for the duration of his rule so that he could be thought to stand "at the focal point between human and divine."[30] To be sure, after the conquest of Egypt in 30 BC, the senate decreed that the young Caesar be honored with a libation at all banquets, although there is no evidence that such a ritual was ever performed in public.[31] Ittai Gradel has even suggested that "the public ceremony was vetoed by young Caesar himself" because such overt worship during his lifetime would have brought his political control of the empire readily into association with monarchical rule, which would have been dangerous and distasteful and which he was naturally keen to avoid.[32]

Yet Augustus was actively and quite visibly engaged in the day-to-day religious practice of the city and eagerly sought—with great success—to make his presence felt in nearly every aspect of Roman civic ritual. A cursory summary of this activity shows that at the beginning of his rule the *princeps* was known at Rome as the protector of the people and the restorer of temples;[33] at its mid-point he was a member of the four most prominent priestly colleges;[34] and during its later phases, when his position was universally accepted and his power virtually unassailable, a cult of the *genius Augusti* seems to have developed within an increasingly more visible cult of the Caesars.[35] Indeed, a statue of his *genius* had been added to the *lares compitales* as part of their

[29] *BC* 5.132; cf. Clauss 1999, 59–60.

[30] Price 1984a, 233, on the figure of the emperor in the ruler cult in the imperial period.

[31] Gaertner 2005, 13 with n. 33.

[32] Gradel 2002, 207.

[33] Latte 1960, 306 n. 4: "*CIL* X 3757; CLE 18 nam quom te Caesar temp[us] exposcet deum, caeloque repetes sed[em qua] mundum reges eqs. Das hindert nicht, dass das Sacellum, in dem anscheinend auch L. und C. Caesar verehrt werden, als templum bezeichnet wird. Es zeigt sich, wie wenig all diese Wörter bedeuten." Cf. Wissowa 1912, 74, for an appraisal of Augustus as *templorum omnium conditor ac restitutor* (Liv. 4.20.7), citing its importance for Augustan *Hofpoesie*, e.g. Hor. *Carm.* 3.6.1–4; Ov. *Fast.* 2.59–66.

[34] Gordon 1990, 189.

[35] Taylor 1931, 204, called the *genius Augusti* "but a thin veil for the emperor himself." For the problems with what he terms the "the *Genius* theory," see Gradel 2002, 77–80, 207–212, and 162, where he writes: "the *Genius* of the living emperor, a cult which did not imply divinity, but certainly did imply social humiliation for the senators involved. Contrary to accepted belief, I have attempted to show that Augustus' *Genius* was never worshipped in the state cult."

restoration in 7 BC when Rome was divided anew into *uici*.[36] The *lares* themselves had previously been termed *augusti*, as in an inscription from the 50s BC, and were easily incorporated into the Augustan building program to suggest that the private family of the emperor had in fact become part of the public domain at Rome.[37] Still, there is no explicit public worship of the emperor as a god in his lifetime within the city, as was clearly the case beyond its walls.[38] According to Gradel, however, private worship of Augustus as divine was in fact widespread throughout the whole of the empire, as a telling passage from Tacitus' *Annales* suggests.[39] The key difference, so Gradel, between Rome and the Italian *municipia* lay in the fact that Augustus' divinity was never recognized as part of the state cult within the city, where the *princeps* consciously tried to keep private and public separate in matters of religion.[40]

Yet the example of the *lares compitales* (*augusti*) cited above shows how difficult—if not impossible—this had become,[41] and Ovid's own explicit treatment of the emperor as a living god may very well have been intended to lay bare the divide between the public image Augustus attempted to maintain and what was the reality on the Roman street and evidently throughout the empire. In a sense, a similar divide characterizes Ovid's poems from exile: they are on the surface private

---

[36] Niebling 1956, 331.

[37] CIL I^2 753 = CIL V 4087, cited by Galinsky 1996, 301 with n. 34. See Latte 1960, 306–307; Wissowa 1912, 75–76.

[38] For example, in the *feriale Cumanum*, a sacrificial calendar from Cumae covering 4–14 AD, Augustus was honored as a god with an *immolatio Caesari hostia*, cited by Mommsen 1882, 641. On the evidence for emperor worship outside Rome, see Gaertner 2005, 12–13; Heckel 2003, 69–71; Habicht 1973, 55–68; Drucker 1977, 13, who cites inscriptions from Pompeii and Nola; and cf. Fishwick 1987, 90: "With its [the Augustan regime's] emphasis on Republican forms, key abstractions, and the worship of state gods closely related to the ruler, what all this amounted to was the cult of the emperor by other than direct means."

[39] Tac. *Ann.* 1.73: *cultores Augusti qui per omnis domos in modum collegiorum habebantur* "worshippers of Augustus, who formed a kind of religious fraternity in every house," on which Gradel 2002, 109–112, and esp. his Ch. 8 "'In Every House'? The Emperor in the Roman Household."

[40] Gradel 2002, 109–139.

[41] For Gradel 2002, 11, the *lares compitales* were "clearly private" insofar as "state priests and state finances had no role to play in these cults," which belonged rather to the "private, but non-familial groupings, *collegia*." Yet the term *augusti* insures that the presence of the emperor was duly felt during the ritual, which though not "public" by Gradel's useful definition (8–13) were nevertheless performed in full "view of the people."

letters (indeed, most are cast as highly personal epistles), while at the same time readily available to the Roman people (there is no compelling reason to assume that they were hard to come by in Rome). This apparent contradiction between private and public informing Ovid's exilic œuvre may capture the essence of the emperor's stance towards his own divinity at Rome: his position as *princeps* and the titles he took from the senate gave him an all-powerful, divine status, which he preferred not to recognize in Roman state cult for fear of looking like an eastern tyrant or Italic king. Indeed, the question of his divinity turned on the nature of his power, and his self-professed *moderatio* prevented him from indulging the idea that he had become a monarch whose position would have required state-sanctioned worship.[42] It was simply better for Augustus' image at home and surely more advantageous for him politically throughout the empire to cultivate the suitably ambiguous divine aura he received from his dominance of nearly every aspect of the Roman state.

From his exiled position on the very margin of the empire Ovid appears to challenge the *princeps*' control over the religious and literary discourse of the city by exalting him to an unprecedented and probably unwelcome position of supreme power within the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto*. In order to understand this problem fully it is necessary to consider the representation of ritual acts and shows of pious devotion that the poet uses to embellish his picture of the emperor as divine. In *Tristia* 2, for example, when Ovid swears by the head of Augustus as a *deus praesens*, he immediately follows the oath with an attestation of his earlier prayers and an act of ritual devotion, 57–60:

> optaui, peteres caelestia sidera tarde,
> parsque fui turbae parua precantis idem,
> et pia tura dedi pro te, cumque omnibus unus
> adiuui uotis publica uota meis.

> I've prayed that you'd join the stars in heaven late in life, and I was a small part of the throng that prayed a single prayer, and I offered devotional incense on your behalf, and as one among many I helped the prayers of the people with prayers of my own.

The passage recalls an earlier one from the first book of the *Tristia*, 1.2.103–104:

[42] Gradel 2002, 265: "Augustus maintained the fiction that Rome was no monarchy; hence he received no divine honours." Cf. *ib.* 109–110; 261–264.

hoc duce si dixi felicia saecula, proque
Caesare tura pius Caesaribusque dedi.

If I've predicted times of happiness under his rule and offered incense in devotion to Caesar and the family of Caesars;

and looks ahead to a similar passage from the first book *ex Ponto*, 1.4.55–56:

turaque Caesaribus cum coniuge Caesare digna,
dis ueris, memori debita ferre manu.

And to offer with a mindful hand incense owed to the Caesars, real gods, together with a wife worthy of Caesar!

All three of these passages were cited in the last chapter for what they reveal about the representation of the *princeps* as a god. It is no surprise that a concomitant feature of Ovid's picture of the *princeps* as divine is the *de facto* worship of that divinity. This is in part the natural result of the title *Augustus*, conferred by the senate in 27 BC.[43] The word is rare before the imperial period and roughly equivalent to "holy" in English. It derived from the sacral language of ancient religion and had before only been used to refer to venerable objects or abstractions. In taking the name *Augustus*, the *princeps* himself became a thing worthy of veneration, a *sacrum*.[44]

Ovid provides the fullest expression of the veneration of the *princeps* towards the end of the exilic corpus in a poem written after the death and state-sanctioned deification of Augustus, *ex Ponto* 4.9, introduced at the very start of this study to underscore the poet's emphasis on

[43] A master-stroke of imperial politics, orchestrated by the unscrupulous opportunist Munatius Plancus, cf. Suet. *Aug.* 7.2–3. The Greek equivalent is σεβαστός "venerable," a word which, as Jolowicz and Nicholas 1972, 343, notes, may have conveyed more meaning throughout the empire than the Latin term, cf. Dio 53.16.8: Αὔγουστος ὡς καὶ πλεῖόν τι ἢ κατὰ ἀνθρώπους "'Augustus': meaning something greater than human;" cf. Price 1984b on the "Greek language of the imperial cult." Connections to the name via *augustus, augurium* and *augere* are made with consistency in Augustan literature, cf. Bömer 1958 ad *Fast.* 1.609–612, and *TLL* II.2.1379.72–1380.8. More generally, Gradel 2002, 112–114.

[44] Ovid refers to the *princeps* by the title "Augustus" at *Tr.* 1.2.102; 2.508; 3.8.13; 4.4.53; *Pont.* 1.2.61; 3.1.135; 4.5.23; 4.6.15; 4.9.70; 4.13.25. He uses *sacer* to refer to the imperial *domus* at *Pont.* 4.6.19–20: *quae prosit pietas utinam mihi, sitque malorum / iam modus et sacrae mitior ira domus* "would that a show of devotion could help me, and let there be a measure to my suffering and milder wrath from the sacred household." The word was eventually applied to the members or attributes of the entire imperial household, *OLD* s.v. *sacer* §7.

the immortalizing power of his poetic craft.[45] He writes the poem on the occasion of Graecinus' consulship and describes the religious rites performed for the assumption of the office.[46] Ovid's description is notably vivid, especially when it comes to giving himself a role in the ceremony, 29–32:

> at cum Tarpeias esses deductus in arces,
> dum caderet iussu uictima sacra tuo,
> me quoque secreto grates sibi magnus agentem
> audisset, media qui sedet aede, deus.

> But when you had been brought to the Tarpeian citadel, while the sacrificial animal fell at your order, the great god, who sits in the middle of the temple, would have heard me too giving thanks to him in secret.

The entire rite plays itself out in the mind of the poet, who uses the power of his imagination to circumvent the punishment of exile and effectively return to Rome. The reference to the *aedes* in the second distich is of course to the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus, and again the analogy analyzed in the last chapter between Augustus and Jupiter refigures indirectly. There follows more description of the same ritual, now linked to Ovid's prayer for a reprieve from exile, 51–54:

> atque utinam, cum iam fueris potiora precatus,
> ut mihi placetur principis ira, roges!
> surgat ad hanc uocem plena pius ignis ab ara,
> detque bonum uoto lucidus omen apex.

> But after you've entreated him on more important matters, please ask the *princeps* to temper his anger towards me! Let the holy flame rise from the altar at your voice, and flash at the top to offer a good omen to your prayer.

Even after the death of Augustus, the poet continues with the poetics of appeal that have as their end the lessening of the anger of the *princeps*, now legally deified and at home in heaven. An integral part of this appeal is the demonstration of his devotion to the cult of the Caesars in the second part of the poem, 105–118:

---

[45] Evans 1983, 154: "The latest poem in the book, *Pont.* 4.9, is to be dated to AD 15, since Ovid congratulates Graecinus on his future consulship the following year." Syme, 1978, 43, puts it "in spring or early summer of 16." Cf. Herbert-Brown 1994, 204.

[46] Graecinus was in fact *consul suffectus* (supplementary consul) for 16, see Syme 1978, 74–75; cf. Helzle 1989, 106–107, for a description of the same rites described at *Pont.* 4.4, another *Konsulatsgedicht* written in honor of Sextus Pompeius' assumption of the consulship on Jan. 1, 14 AD.

nec pietas ignota mea est: uidet hospita terra
in nostra sacrum Caesaris esse domo.
stant pariter natusque pius coniunxque sacerdos,
numina iam facto non leuiora deo.
neu desit pars ulla domus, stat uterque nepotum,
hic auiae lateri proximus, ille patris.
his ego do totiens cum ture precantia uerba,
Eoo quotiens surgit ab orbe dies.
tota, licet quaeras, hoc me non fingere dicet,
officii testis, Pontica terra, mei
Pontica me tellus, quantis hac possumus ara,
natalem libis[47] scit celebrare dei.
nec minus hospitibus pietas est cognita talis,
misit in has siquos longa Propontis aquas.

> My devotion's well-known: a foreign land sees that there's a shrine to Caesar in my house. Next to one another stand his loyal son and priestess wife—no lesser deities than the one who's already been made into a god. So that no part of his family is missing, both grandsons stand there: one at his grandmother's side, the other his father's. To them I offer words of prayer with incense as often as the day rises in the East. The whole of the Pontic land, the witness to my duty—you can ask them—will say that I'm not making it up. The Pontic soil knows that I celebrate the god's birthday by offering as many cakes as the altar can hold, and the kind of devotion I practice is also well-known to any visitors the distant Propontis happens to have sent to these shores.

It is hard to imagine that Ovid actually possessed a Caesarian shrine of any kind, and the types of devotion he represents here are presumably the product of his fertile and playfully irreverent imagination.

Yet why make up something so particular and relate it in such detail? This question is in fact fundamental to analyzing the tight interplay of myth and ritual in the exile poetry. From what we have seen thus far, it looks as if the ritual acts on view here help to flesh out the representation of the *princeps* as the most powerful deity within the mythological framework of these poems. Indeed, the statues, incense, prayers, and cakes—in short, the poet's lavish show of *pietas*—are the inevitable end of an exilic mythology where actual persons, the Caesars, have outstripped the traditional gods of the Greco-Roman pantheon. Not surprisingly, at the close of the poem under discussion comes the wish (or rather the assurance) that Augustus, recently added to the stars

[47] Hall's emendation for *ludis*, cf. Wheeler and Goold 1988, ad loc.

and now an all-knowing god in heaven, will hear and answer favorably Ovid's prayers, 125–134:

> et tamen haec tangent aliquando Caesaris aures.
> nil illi, toto quod fit in orbe, latet.
> tu certe scis haec, superis ascite, uidesque
> Caesar, ut est oculis subdita terra tuis.
> tu nostras audis inter conuexa locatus
> sidera, sollicito quas damus ore, preces.
> perueniant istuc et carmina forsitan illa,
> quae de te misi caelite facta nouo.
> auguror his igitur flecti tua numina, nec tu
> inmerito nomen mite Parentis habes.

> All this will reach Caesar's ears some day, for nothing happens in the whole world that lies hidden from him. You know this for sure, Caesar, now adopted by the gods above, and you see it, as the earth has been placed beneath your eyes. Amid the stars in heaven's vault you hear the prayers that I offer from my anxious lips. Perhaps even those poems I sent about you as a new god may come there.[48] Thus I predict that these prayers will prevail upon your divinity, for rightly do you hold the title of merciful Father.

The close of the poem takes up again several of the themes I have discussed thus far. To start, the divine Augustus is still the controlling deity of the mythological framework of the exile poetry, a status which corresponds to the status of Zeus-Jupiter in Greco-Roman myth. In addition, the title for his divinity, *Pater* (here *Parens* [134]), derives from a legal decree of the senate, bestowed to match the military might of his legions. And finally, Ovid's poems from exile not only include obsequious appeals that refer to the *princeps* and his family as divine but also represent devotion to those divinities as they exist within the inchoate cult of the Caesars. It is here, in the devotion to the Caesars as gods of the state, that the poetry of Ovid's exile makes its most

[48] Ovid's claim to have written a poem on the occasion of Augustus' deification on Sept. 17, 14 AD, which he also mentions in *Pont.* 4.6.17–18: *quale tamen potui, de caelite, Brute, recenti / uestra procul positus carmen in ora dedi* "though in exile far away, Brutus, I have nevertheless offered for your reading the kind of poem I could write about the newly made god," sounds much like the claim to have written a Getic poem (*Pont.* 4.13.17–42), which Evans 1983, 159, suggests may be the same poem. But both are more likely the poet's invention and refer indirectly to the poems from exile themselves; see Helzle 1989, 136, and the ingenious interpretation of *Pont.* 4.13.33: *ubi non patria perlegi scripta Camena* "when I read through what I had composed with the help of a foreign muse," offered by Heckel 2003, 90 n. 71, who connects the verse to the opening of Livius Andronicus' *Odusia*, fr. 1: *Virum mihi, Camena, insece uersutum* "Tell me, Muse, of the crafty man."

significant contribution to the new shape of Roman religion in the early principate: what looks like a typical divinity of the literary tradition in the way it sits atop the mythological framework of these poems is also, and perhaps primarily, a legal divinity of the state cult with its attendant devotees and, as I shall show, priests. In this connection the previous poem, *Pont.* 4.8, contains even more material for elucidating the divide between the religion of the state and the myths of the poets. There Ovid contrasts his own sacred rites as poet and *uates* with the religious rites performed by a devotee of the divine Germanicus, a certain Suillius. Suillius is not only a follower in the young general's train; he is also a priest, *antistes* (25), in an early form of the cult of the Caesars. Before tackling this problem in earnest it is necessary to look at Varro's *Res Diuinae* and his application of the *theologia tripertita* to the study of Roman religion.

The theologia tripertita *in Varro*

Here is not the place to discuss the influence of Varro on the Augustan religious revival.[49] The following analysis seeks rather to determine to what extent that learning can be brought to bear on the interpretation of Ovid's exile poetry.[50] Varro's work, the *Res Diuinae*, examines in sixteen books the priestly offices, cult-sites, festivals, rituals, and gods in Roman religion.[51] Had they survived, they would have made up the lesser part of the monumental *Antiquitates*, of which the *Res Humanae* filled 25 books and which were said to have been dedicated to the *pontifex maximus* at the time, Julius Caesar.[52] Varro's intent, it seems, was to spur Caesar to action in helping to save certain aspects of Roman religion from ruin in the face of neglect:

---

[49] This has often been done elsewhere, e.g. Latte 1960, 6 and 293; Boyancé 1955 = 1972, 253; Cardauns 1978, 87–89; Rawson 1985, 301; Lehmann 1997, 165–166. Recently Rüpke 2005, 124, has argued that Varro's "*tria genera theologiae* did not have any lasting impact." Green 2002, 72, may go too far assessing the influence of the *tripertita* on the composition of the *Fasti*.

[50] For general scholarly agreement on Ovid's knowledge of Varro's writings, see Merkel 1841, cvi; Latte 1960, 6 with n. 2; Graf 1988, 68; Green 2002.

[51] Cardauns 1976, *RD* fr. 4 = August. *C.D.* 6.3: *quadriginta et unum libros scripsit antiquitatum; hos in res humanas diuinasque diuisit, rebus humanis uiginti quinque, diuinis sedecim tribuit* "he wrote 41 books of *Antiquities*, which he divided into human and divine affairs, allotting 25 to the human, 16 to the divine."

[52] See above n. 7.

> in eo ipso opere litterarum suarum dicat se timere ne pereant (sc. dei), non incursu hostili, sed ciuium neglegentia, de qua illos uelut ruina liberari a se dicit et in memoria bonorum per eius modi libros recondi atque seruari utiliore cura, quam Metellus de incendio sacra Vestalia et Aeneas de Troiano excidio penates liberasse praedicatur. (Cardauns *RD* fr. 2a = August. *C.D.* 6.2)

> In that very work he says that he was afraid of the gods dying out not by enemy attack, but from citizens' neglect. He freed the gods from this neglect as if from destruction, he says, by writing books that store up and preserve the gods in the memory of good men with a show of care more useful than Metellus is said to have shown when he saved the Vestal virgins' sacred objects from fire and even than Aeneas when he saved the household gods from the fall of Troy.

By hoping to restore Rome's traditional gods to life Varro may in fact have helped to secure their death.[53] At the very least, he ensured that Caesar, then Augustus after him, had access to the forgotten antiquities of Roman religious practice which both were more easily able to "restore" after, in Varro's words, upper-class negligence had let them slide.[54] Varro's project of antiquarianism was from the outset a political one, and his dedicatee was the most prominent political figure of his day.[55]

In drawing on Varro to interpret Ovid I shall be concerned here primarily with the *theologia tripertita* or tripartite theology. The *tripertita* is often adduced in the interpretation of literary texts with some relation to Roman religious practice and is generally considered to have been a tenet of Stoic thought.[56] But the Stoicism behind it is difficult to define in context, and while I would not venture to discount Varro's debt to Stoic doctrine, in what follows it is perhaps best, following

---

[53] Lehmann 1997, 162: "Varron a mis spontanément son idéologie religieuse au service des revendications régaliennes et dynastiques de l'*imperator* romain."

[54] Cf. Aug. *RG* 8.5: *legibus nouis [me auctore] latis multa exempla maiorum exolescentia iam ex nostro saeculo reduxi et ipse multarum rerum exempla imitanda posteris tradidi* "by enacting new laws, I have restored many of our ancestors' traditions which were dying out in our age and have myself passed on precedents in many things for future generations to imitate."

[55] Latte 1960, 293: "[Varro] hatte durchaus religionspolitische Zwecke;" and Tarver 1996, 39–40. Cf. Syme 1978, 174: "The study of Roman antiquities benefited enormously from the years of tribulation, being one form of escape from the evil present, and more congenial (to some at least) than Arcadia, the Age of Gold and Fortunate Isles. Like the writing of history, old documents and sacerdotal law were a suitable refuge and consolation for the statesman deprived of action or public eloquence."

[56] Rawson 1985, 313. On the larger influence of stoic thought on Varro see Latte 1960, 6.

Lieberg's study, to consider the *tripertita* an accepted *Denkform* or mode of thinking from the Hellenistic period on for arranging the gods in various religious contexts.[57]

In applying this mode of thinking to understanding the gods of Rome Varro divides the tripartite scheme among the poets, philosophers, and priests and speaks in turn of a mythical, natural, and civil theology. The following passage stems from an extended quotation in St. Augustine's *City of God* (6.5 = Cardauns *RD* fr. 10):

> deinde illud quale est quod tria genera theologiae dicit [Varro] esse, id est rationis quae de diis explicatur, eorumque unum mythicon appellari, alterum physicon, tertium ciuile? Latine si usus est admitteret, genus quod primum posuit fabulare appellaremus, sed fabulosum dicamus; a fabulis enim mythicon dictum est, quoniam μῦθος Graece fabula dicitur. Secundum autem ut naturale dicatur iam et consuetudo locutionis admittit. tertium etiam ipse latine enuntiauit, quod ciuile appellatur. deinde ait: "Mythicon appellant quo maxime utuntur poetae; physicon quo philosophi; ciuile quo populi" . . . "tertium genus est [ciuile]" inquit, "quod in urbibus ciues, maxime sacerdotes, nosse atque administrare debent. in quo est quos deos publice † sacra et sacrificia colere et facere quemque par sit." † adhuc quod sequitur adtendamus. "Prima," inquit "theologia maxime accomodata est ad theatrum, secunda ad mundum, tertia ad urbem."

> Then [we shall discuss] the nature of what Varro calls the three kinds of theology, that is, a tripartite way of speaking about the gods: the first is called mythic, the second physic, the third civil. If Latin usage allowed, we would call the kind he put first "storied," but let's call it "mythical;" for the word "mythic" is derived from stories, since *mythos* is the Greek word for story. The second is commonly called "natural," and the third—the "civil"—he himself gave a Latin name. In fact, here are his own words: "They call what the poets use 'mythical', what the philosophers use 'natural', and what the people use 'civil' . . . This third kind is what citizens in cities, especially priests, ought to have practical knowledge of and administer. For according to it there are gods to whom it is reasonable for everyone to show devotion in public and perform

[57] Lieberg 1973, 107: ". . . so dürfte evident werden, daß man die Dreiteilung nicht als Doktrin eines bestimmten griechischen Denkers oder einer bestimmten philosophischen Schule, die in der Folge von späteren Denkern oder Schulen übernommen und abgewandelt worden wäre, sondern als universale Denkform verstehen muß, mit deren Hilfe mindestens seit der Zeit der hellenistischen Philosophie das antike Denken die durch Gesetz, Mythos und Spekulation vermittelte religiöse Wirklichkeit in ihrer Vielsichtigkeit und Verschiendenartigkeit besser zu erfassen suchte." Similarly, Daube 1969, 129, on the philosophy of Roman law. Cf. Feeney 1998, 15–17; and now Rüpke 2005, 107–118, for Varro as the originator of the *tria genera theologiae*, albeit building on a Greek (philosophical) tradition.

> sacred rites and sacrifices." Still let us attend to what he said later: "the first type of theology relates especially to the theater, the second to the universe, the third to the city."

Varro presents the division of the mythical, natural, and civil theologies as the difference—broadly conceived—between the theater, the stoa, and the temple, that is, between stories, precepts, and rites, or what might be recast more generously as a division of *myth*, *belief*, and *cult*. The first and last of these are clearly my immediate concern in this study insofar as Ovid engages directly with myth and cult from the start of his exilic collection to the end. At the same time, I would like to avoid getting inextricably entangled in the more intricate question of belief that inevitably arises from an analysis of the *tripertita*'s natural theology. For what Ovid "believed" cannot be assumed to be determined from what he wrote about himself in exile, and any attempt to do so is bound to fail. Moreover, the *tripertita*'s natural theology is intimately linked to the larger political undertaking of Varro's *Antiquitates*, where it helps to articulate a belief system for those running the state and responsible for upholding its institutions. For Varro—and here we can readily identify the influence of Stoicism—such a belief system necessarily ties the identity of the individual (philosopher) to an active life in politics. By contrast, Ovid, who may be politically engaged, is nevertheless no statesman or sage in the Stoic sense; nor is he manifestly concerned with matters of natural theology. Thus a more prudent (and ultimately more productive) approach will confine itself to an analysis of what Ovid wrote, which identifiably includes the mythical gods of poets and the sacred rites of priests.[58] Indeed, *Pont.* 4.8 invites just such an approach because of the distinction made there between its addressee, Suillius, who is identified as an *antistes* or priest, and its addressor, Ovid himself. In the course of the poem, moreover, the poet turns away from Suillius to apostrophize the young Caesar, Germanicus, who as both *poeta* and future *princeps* has the potential to bridge the gap between addressor and addressee by uniting within himself the concerns of both the mythical and civil theologies.

---

[58] In fact, Augustine himself chose to proceed in a similar fashion, taking the mythical and civil theologies first and only returning to address the natural theology of philosophers two books later, cf. August. *C.D.* 6.6: *sequestrata igitur paululum theologia quam naturalem uocant, de qua postea disserendum est* "having thus separated for a while the natural theology, which we shall discuss later."

It is of course true—as both Varro and St. Augustine already noticed (August. *C.D.* 6.6)—that the civil and mythical theologies hold many gods in common, with Jupiter, Juno, and Minerva among the more conspicuous. At the same time, the *theologia tripertita* clearly distinguishes the verse composition of poets, whose stories were thought to be predominantly fictive and told for the delight their audience, from the cult practice of priests, whose maintenance of religious ritual helped preserve cultural continuity and civic order. It is surely noteworthy in this connection that well before Ovid's exile, the emperor Augustus had become the most important priest in Rome. He was at once *pontifex maximus*, *augur*, and *quindecimvir*, that is, the sole or co-occupant of the three most important Roman priesthoods that also form the first triad of Varro's *Res Diuinae*.[59] By any measure, when the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* were being composed in Tomis, the *princeps* had accumulated a raft of priestly titles that gave him a powerful purchase on religious ritual activity in Rome and throughout the empire.

As noted in the last chapter, Ovid is keen in the exile poetry to construct a mythological framework to accommodate the *princeps* as both a powerful god of the literary tradition and also a divinity to be worshipped for the titles he receives from the senate. The two aspects of Augustus' divinity—that he is a god of the state *and* a god of myth—correspond neatly to the civil and mythical theologies in the *tripertita* found in Varro. Immediately, however, the problem arises that what Varro keeps separate, Ovid brings together. Put another way, Augustus becomes a new kind of divinity whose essential nature requires a new set of categories to define it. The following analysis of *Pont.* 4.8 is in many ways a test of the viability of using the *theologia tripertita* to interpret Ovid. This poem serves as a felicitous starting point for such a test because it resumes many of the themes that occupy Ovid over the eight and a half books of elegies that precede. At the same time, *Pont.* 4.8 is situated at that critical moment in Roman history that witnessed Augustus' death and Tiberius' succession to the rule of the empire, another dramatic point in Roman affairs that made the permanence of the principate manifest to all in the city.[60] Here, Ovid reflects on

[59] Gordon 1990, 198: "a member of the four most distinguished priestly colleges (*amplissima collegia*)." Cf. Wissowa 1912, 76–77; and see Beard and North 1990, 11–12, on the complex nature of priesthood in the ancient Roman world, esp. on the "fusion between religion and politics."

[60] The couplet 63–64 alludes to the deification of Augustus and secures a date after

the position of poetry within the recently (and permanently) refigured society of Rome and the new phase in Roman religion that came with it when he writes, 55: *di quoque carminibus, si fas est dicere, fiunt* "Gods too—if it is right to say—are created by poetry."

di quoque carminibus si fas est dicere fiunt

In keeping with the later exilic poems' mode of petitioning individual Romans with potential influence at the imperial court, *Pont.* 4.8 begins as a letter of direct appeal to a certain Suillius, steeped in studies, 1: *studiis exculte Suilli.* In addition to being a devoted supporter of Germanicus, this poem's addressee is also apparently the husband of Ovid's stepdaughter, or as the poet says wryly at the letter's end (90), his almost-son-in-law. Yet Suillius is not simply a devotee in the military train of Germanicus with family ties to Ovid, but as we read at verse 23, for him the young Caesar is a god, *di tibi sunt Caesar iuuenis*. At the god's altar, moreover, Suillius serves as priest (*antistes*) within what appears to be an early form of the cult of the Caesars. After lingering on what that priestly service entails (25–30), the poem shifts emphasis from Suillius to begin at verse 31 an extended apostrophe to a fellow *uates* and the future *princeps*, Germanicus himself, on the well-known literary topos from Ovid and elsewhere: the power of poetry to convey everlasting fame on its subject matter.[61]

As part of this apostrophe, Ovid compares for Germanicus the merits of poetry over against the temporal honors of day-to-day religious worship, including the dedication of temples (31–34), the burning of incense (39–40), and the sacrifice of animals (41–42). For Ovid the tribute of poet-prophets, *officium uatum* (43), confers immortality and is therefore more fit for *principes uiri*[62] (44) than material gifts susceptible to decay over time, 49–50:

---

his death in August of 14 AD and Tiberius' accession to power at Rome. Cf. *Fast.* 1.531–534 with Feeney's note, 1992, 21 n. 29.

[61] The fame bestowed by poetry was a conventional topos in Greek and Latin poetry, e.g. Alcm. 148 (Davies), Sapph. 32 (Lobel-Page), *Hom. h.Ap.* 166–176; Enn. *Ann.* 12 (Skutsch); Hor. *Carm.* 2.20 (cf. Nisbet and Hubbard 1978, 335–336, 344–345); 3.30 (cf. Bauer 1962, 17–18); 4.3; Prop. 4.1; Ov. *Am.* 1.15; *Met.* 15.871–879; see Rahn 1958, 107.

[62] The combination *principes uiri* in v. 44 seems to imply both mortal and divine qualities found in the ideal Roman statesman elucidated above, Ch. 3 n. 49. At the same time, the *princeps uir* at Rome is officially the emperor—in this case, Tiberius—

tabida consumit ferrum lapidemque uetustas,
nullaque res maius tempore robur habet.

Wasting old age consumes both stone and iron; nothing has greater strength than time.

Despite his membership in the imperial family, Germanicus' *uirtus* still needs poetry to become like the immortalized ἀρετή of the mythic heroes from Homer and the Greek tragedians, 51–54:

scripta ferunt annos. scriptis Agamemnona nosti,
et quisquis contra uel simul arma tulit.
quis Thebas septemque duces sine carmine nosset,
et quidquid post haec, quidquid et ante fuit?

What's written lasts for years: through writing you know of Agamemnon and whoever bore arms with or against him. Who would know of Thebes and her seven leaders and what happened before and afterwards without verse?

The hexameter quoted above, *di quoque carminibus si fas est dicere fiunt*, marks at verse 55 the transition in this mythological catalogue from heroes to gods. What follows after verse 57 is a catalogue—à la Hesiod—on the ages of gods, starting with Chaos, passing to the Giants, and Jupiter and the struggle for Olympus, and on to the demi-gods, Liber and Hercules, who prefigure the newest divinities, the Caesars.[63] Even Augustus depends partly on *carmina* for the worship of his divinity, 63–64:

---

whose divinity can only be recognized by the state after his death. Yet see Turcan 1998, 200, who cites N.D. Fustel de Coulanges, *La Cité antique* (Paris 1864): "[L'empereur] était dieu parce qu'il était empereur."

[63] Ovid chose to include Liber and Hercules at this point in the catalogue because both fought with consequence in the Gigantomachy, a popular subject among Latin poets of the early principate as an allegory for the exploits of Augustus, e. g. Tib. 2.5 (*viz.* Titanomachy), and one that Ovid claims himself to have chosen for an epic poem celebrating the *inmania Caesaris acta* (the mighty deeds of Caeasar) at *Tr.* 2.335, on which see Williams 1994, 190–191 with n. 69. Ovid had already given the myth of divine succession from Chaos to the establishment of the Olympian order and the defeat of the Giants prominent treatment at the opening of the *Metamorphoses* 1.5–162 and also refers in that poem to the myths of Bacchus and Hercules cited here, 15.413; 9.136–137. Moreover, both Bacchus and Hercules were perceived as conquerers from the Hellenistic period on and served as suggestive mythical models for real-world conquerers such as Alexander the Great, L. Mummius (cos. 146 BC, sacker of Corinth, who dedicated a temple to Hercules Victor on Rome's Caelian hill in 142 BC), Mark Antony, and Augustus (Octavianus) himself early in his career; see Bernhardt 1986, 271 n. 5.

> et modo, Caesar, auum, quem uirtus addidit astris,
> sacrarunt aliqua carmina parte tuum.
>
> And recently, Caesar, your grandfather, whom virtue put in heaven, was made an object of worship in part by poetry.

With the phrase *aliqua parte* Ovid implies that the act of making an object of worship, *sacro*, needs more than a legal decree of the senate: *uirtus* may have put Augustus into heaven, but worship requires prayer and the use of a sacred language known to poets, in particular to *uates*.

No doubt behind these *carmina* stand Vergil's *Aeneid* and the several pictures of Augustus from Horace's poems cited in the last chapter, in addition to Ovid's own *Metamorphoses* and the poems he claims to have written in exile on the apotheosis of the emperor (*Pont.* 4.6.17–18; 4.9.131–132). These parallels would not have been lost on the *poeta doctus* Germanicus, who will get what little *ingenium* Ovid has left if he honors his own status as *uates*, 65–66:

> non potes officium uatis contemnere uates:
> iudicio pretium res habet ista tuo
>
> As a *uates* yourself, you cannot spurn the service of a *uates*: that thing has value in your opinion.

Had he not been a Caesar, Ovid notes, Germanicus would have become the greatest glory of the Pierides, the Muses of Greek poetry.[64] Yet he continues to dabble in verse (73–74), and his mastery of both the martial and poetic arts makes him most like Apollo (75–78). His status as future *princeps*, current general, and celebrated *uates* inevitably entails that he combine Greek poetry and Roman war and duly acknowledge the sacred rites of poetry, *communia sacra* (81), which he shares with Ovid and which are to be distinguished from Suillius' sacred rites in the cult of the Caesars. But there is another distinction to be made here: Germanicus is not a god for Ovid as he is for Suillius; he is a *uates*, the *uates et princeps* (*futurus*) to Ovid's *exul et uates*. In the end, *Pont.* 4.8 serves Germanicus, the most exceptional individual of the new imperial regime, straddling the boundaries between general and poet on the one hand, man and god on the other, as a learned discourse

[64] 69–70: *quod nisi te nomen tantum ad maiora uocasset, / gloria Pieridum summa futurus eras* "but if your family name had not summoned you to greater things, you would have been Muses' greatest glory;" cf. *Am.* 1.1.6: *Pieridum uates, non tua* [Amoris], *turba sumus* "we are the Muses' poets, not part of your throng, Cupid," and Germ. *Arat.* 145–146.

(or earnest admonition) on poetic immortality from the famed poet and exile, Ovidius Naso.

The figure mentioned at the outset of the poem, the studious Suillius, is represented as a priest at the altar of the young Caesar's *numen*. He was for Ronald Syme, exile in 24 and a consulship in 43 notwithstanding, only of interest as "a devoted adherent to Germanicus."[65] But Suillius is not just another adherent characterized by a form of *pietas* (8) which finds its expression in his role as priest. For Ovid, he is also a potential source for a reprieve, 26: *nostris pete rebus opem* "seek help for my situation." Should Suillius actually manage to ameliorate the exile's condition, Ovid promises to become a devotee himself, 29–30:

> tunc ego tura feram rapidis sollemnia flammis,
> et ualeant quantum numina testis ero

> Then I myself shall bring solemn incense to the quickening flames and shall testify to the power of their divinity.

Whether Ovid is sincere or not about his profession of future devotion—and it is hard to imagine that he is—is not as critical for the present analysis as seeing that on Varro's terms the difference between Ovid and Suillius is the difference between the mythical and civil theologies.[66] Augustus' own accumulation of priestly titles while he was alive made him the most important upholder of civil religious practice at Rome. Even before his death, he was the recipient of divine honors, whether veiled and in private within the city or explicit and in public as those he was wont to receive outside Rome, especially on the northeastern frontier of the empire where Ovid spends his exile. Indeed, after the example of Augustus, it becomes possible for the Romans to experience individuals, that is, members of the imperial family, who not only attend to ritual but are themselves the object of ritual devotion. From exile, Ovid takes note of the novel state of religious affairs back home. He sees that the *princeps* and his family have assumed a prominent position in the ritual activity of Rome's civil religion and, in consequence, makes the imperial family into correspondingly dominant divine beings within the mythological framework of the exile

[65] Syme 1978, 79.

[66] The notion that a priest can exist "outside" the political structure of the state is modern and wholly antithetical to ancient Greek and Roman conceptions of priesthood, cf. Beard and North 1990, 1: "pagan priests never … stood apart from the political order."

poetry. Augustus in particular is singled out as the most powerful and pervasive god in the Roman pantheon, and the entire divine apparatus of the exile poetry may be said to have been built up in support of him.

In the present poem, Ovid insists that the existence of these gods, in particular their essentially immortal nature, depends in part on the immortality bestowed by literature. Indeed, the divinity of the deified Augustus may be brought into historical reality by the legal decrees of the senate and, to a lesser extent, by the worship of devotees in Rome. The end of the Roman empire and its rule of law, however, to say nothing of the neglect of the rites used to worship the Caesars in cult, will put an end to his deified status. Ovid's picture of Augustus and the imperial family as divine, by contrast, remains as long as his poems continue to be read and to retain their capacity to immortalize their subject. In essence, the legally deified Augustus becomes a poetically realized god in Ovid's exile poetry. This transition from legal decree to poetic verse also involves change, a kind of metamorphosis that underscores just how different the one (legal) is from the other (poetic). The *kind* of god Augustus is in the exile poetry, his new shape created as it were in the move from Rome to Tomis, has not concerned me as much thus far as that he is depicted as an actual god with divine powers and devoted followers. In the closing chapter I shall look more closely at the image Ovid draws of Augustus as a vengeful god of retribution most frequently characterized by *ira*. For now it is enough to recognize that the poet, though censored and exiled, lays claim to an immortalizing power for poetry that gives him an immediate stake in what constitutes divinity at Rome.

Here, in the face of the immortalizing power of poetry that is intimately engaged in the politics of its society, the *theologia tripertita* found in Varro breaks down as a tool for interpreting Ovid's poems from exile. For Varro, the myths of poets are largely untrue; they frequently contain ridiculous stories disengaged from a conception of the divine realized in the rituals performed by priests or, for that matter, in the arguments formulated by philosophers.[67] Varro was above all a scholar and philosopher in the Roman tradition, and though he was doubtless aware of the frequent overlap in myth, politics, and philosophy (cf. August. *C.D.* 6.6–9), his rational approach to understanding the representation of divinity leads to divisions between the mythical and civil

---

[67] Cf. Rüpke 2005, 115, on "justification and even polemics" in Varro's *tria genera theologiae*.

theologies that are perhaps too neat for my investigation here. He separates, for example, the stories of the theater from the rites of the temple. Ovid, however, who of course has reasons for defending the gods of the poets, indicates that overlap is inherent to both. In *Tristia* 2, for example, the poet writes, 287–288:

> quis locus est templis augustior? haec quoque uitet,
> in culpam siqua est ingeniosa suam.
>
> What place is more wholly Augustan than temples? But let them too be avoided by any woman with a natural disposition to sin.

Clearly the poet is at play here as he answers the charge that the wrong reading material can be a spur to bad behavior: sin, he notes, is a question of character and has as little to do with temples as with the stories about the gods that inhabit them.[68] But Ovid is also subtly goading the emperor; for the temple of great Mars, he goes on to mention (295: *magni templum, tua munera, Martis*), was the ideological cornerstone of the Augustan imperial building program.[69] For my purposes, the comparison Ovid makes between reading and monuments is instructive for what it says about the very interconnectedness of poems and temples at Rome: they are both integral elements in the religious culture of the city, itself now permeated by a new political structure under Augustus.

Varro's categories from the *theologia tripertita* were developed specifically in order to delineate, at least on one level, between poetry and politics,[70] and indeed these categories have been crucial to the formulation of my arguments over the last two chapters. Thus far, I hope to have demonstrated, first, how earlier poetic representations of mythical divinities provide Ovid with material to reshape the image of the (legally) deified Augustus within the mythological framework of his exile poetry and, second, that this new, exilic mythology marks a significant,

---

[68] Cf. *Tr.* 2.257–258: *quodcumque attigerit, siqua est studiosa sinistri, / ad uitium mores instruet inde suos* "If a woman's bent on immorality, it does not matter what she reads: she will guide her behavior towards vice;" 275–276: *sic igitur carmen, recta si mente legatur, / constabit nulli posse nocere meum* "and so clearly, if my poetry is read with an upright mind, it will not be able to harm anyone."

[69] Barchiesi 1997, 32, has recognized the pointed irony of Ovid's mentioning of Augustus' own building projects as conducive to sin: "Ovid's works are no more to blame than are the imperial monuments, circuses, theaters, arcades, and even temples. It would be no more senseless to pull them down than it had been to wipe out the *Ars amatoria*."

[70] Rüpke 2005, 118, stresses the importance of Varro's political purpose, which was to give "theoretical status" to traditional religious practice at Rome.

even if uncomfortable, contribution to the Roman religious discourse of the early principate. At this point in my investigation, however, it is also necessary to recognize the way in which the *theologia tripertita* found in Varro fails to account for Ovid's picture of the divine Augustus in the exile poetry. The *princeps*—whether Augustus, Tiberius, or (had he lived longer) even Germanicus—is at once a civil divinity with attendant priests like Suillius *and* a newly created mythical divinity familiar from the poets of the Greco-Roman literary tradition. The collapse in the division between Varro's categories points to a larger historical development that took place within the fifty-or-so intervening years that separate the *Antiquitates* from the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto*. In effect, just as a civil deity that is also the living *princeps* and a legally deified god-to-be is new to Roman religious history, so too is Ovid's poetic representation of the divine Augustus and his family something new to Latin literature.

Preliminary Conclusion

It is one thing to show how historical circumstances change and even to suggest why the changes took place. It is something else to determine what those changes meant for the individuals that actually experienced them. For example, I have shown how Ovid, following an historical shift that saw the emperor assume primacy of place in the religious discourse at Rome, surpasses his predecessors in referring to the *princeps* and his family as divine. In addition to the frequent references to the *princeps* as a god Ovid even shows devotion to his cult. It is perhaps here—in Ovid's show of *pietas*, ironic and rhetorically necessary as it may be—that it is possible to locate the meaning of the historical changes for (one of) the subjects involved. In order to illustrate this point Varro again becomes useful, in particular St. Augustine's remarks on Varro's censure of the gods of the poets, *C.D.* 6.5:

> Hic certe ubi potuit, ubi ausus est, ubi inpunitum putauit, quanta mendacissimis fabulis naturae deorum fieret iniuria, sine caligine ullius ambiguitatis expressit. Loquebatur enim non de naturali theologia, non de ciuili, sed de fabulosa, quam libere a se putauit esse culpandam.

> Here at any rate where he could, where he dared, where he thought he was above punishment, Varro expressed without the shading of any ambiguity how much wrong was imputed to the nature of the gods from the most mendacious myths. For he was speaking not about a natural

theology nor about a civil one but about a mythical one, which he thought he had to censure without restraint.

On the one hand, Varro's act of "censure" (*culpare*) may be thought to prefigure the censure Augustus applied to Ovid by banning the *Ars* and banishing him to Tomis. Yet Varro's words on the myths of the poets are cast as an act of daring, done without fear of punishment. In this passage, Augustine appears to problematize Varro's actions to a degree that is difficult to accept. It is hard to believe, for example, that Varro ever had to consider (*puto*) whether he would be punished by mythical gods. In his eyes—the eyes of a Stoic—they did not exist and hence could not have inspired fear. Augustine's problem seems to arise from the contrast between the unified vision for Christianity that he was trying to devise for a nascent and still pluralistic religious system and the very disparate character of Roman religion in the late republic. Augustine suggests that the capacity to inspire fear is a constituent element of genuine divinity, and indeed, it is here, in the ability to inspire fear, that Varro's gods of myth differ from the picture of the divine Caesars that Ovid has drawn in the exile poetry. Varro has no need to fear the actions of mythical gods he may encounter in poetry (or, for that matter, events of nature that Stoics credit to a divine providence beyond human control). Ovid, on the other hand, often gives voice to his fear of the *princeps* as a god.[71] Again, whether this fear is sincere is not as significant as that it is relevant to Ovid's characterization of the Caesars as gods. As has already been noted in this study, the poet professes to feel guilty at having incurred the displeasure of Augustus, Rome's newest god. He goes so far as to state that his punishment, exile, is not as difficult to bear as the mere knowledge of having wronged the *princeps*, *Tr.* 5.11.11: *maxima poena mihi est ipsum offendisse* "the greatest punishment for me is to have offended him."

---

[71] *Tr.* 1.1.81–82: *me quoque, quae sensi, fateor Iouis arma timere: / me reor infesto, cum tonat, igne peti* "I admit that I'm also afraid of Jupiter's arms, which I've actually felt: when it thunders, I feel as if I'm being attacked by enemy fire;" 3.1.53–54: *me miserum! uereorque locum uereorque potentem, / et quatitur trepido littera nostra metu* "Woe is me! I'm afraid of both the place and powerful man, and my writing's literally shaking from my trembling hand;" 5.8.27–28; *Pont.* 2.7.55: *quis non horruerit tacitam quoque Caesaris iram* "Who would not dread even the silent wrath of Caesar?" At the same time, he can also praise the *princeps* for his clemency, e.g. *Pont.* 3.6.23–24: *principe nec nostro deus est moderatior ullus: / Iustitia uires temperat ille suas* "No god is milder than our emperor, who tempers his might with justice."

A similar idea resurfaces in a crucial passage from the first poem in the *Epistulae ex Ponto*. I have already analyzed this passage in connection with Ovid's legal status in exile (59–60) and with the poems' mythological framework (83). It shows Ovid engaged in the kind of reflection about the nature of his punishment that is typical for the exile poetry, *Pont.* 1.1.61–64:

> cumque sit exilium, magis est mihi culpa dolori,
> estque pati poenam, quam meruisse, minus.
> ut mihi di faueant, quibus est manifestior ipse,
> poena potest demi, culpa perennis erit.

> Though exile is grievous to me, the guilt is moreso, and to suffer punishment is less than to have deserved it. Though I may be favored by the gods, than whom he is himself more manifest, the punishment can be removed, the guilt will last forever.[72]

Unlike Varro's *dei fabulosi*, the divine Caesars in Ovid's exile poetry have the power to inspire fear, and as in the above poem that fear brings with it an unabashed profession of guilt. This marks a unique contribution to the changing shape of Roman religion in the early principate. Indeed, the most critical commentary on the Augustan regime offered by Ovid in the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* is to be found in the poet's paradoxical stance towards his exile: the fear and guilt inspired by the divine Caesars, by Augustus in particular, is presented as even more severe than the truly harsh punishment that these same gods can and do exact. At the very least, readers of Ovid's poetic response to his exile, itself unprecedented and difficult to explain, will learn that repression was real in the early principate and that fear, evidently, was well-founded.

---

[72] *Pont.* 1.1 is central to understanding Ovid's treatment of Augustus as divine in relation to other religious rites, e.g. 43–46: *ipsa mouent animos superorum numina nostros, turpe nec est tali credulitate capi: / en ego pro sistro Phyrigiique foramine buxi / gentis Iuleae nomina sancta fero* "The gods above stir my heart, and it is not unseemly to be caught up in such belief: look, instead of a sistrum or pipe of Phrygian box-wood, I carry the sacred names of the Julian clan." See also 55–56: *talia caelestes fieri praeconia gaudent, / ut sua quid ualeant numina teste probent* "the gods rejoice in such pronouncements that offer the proof of a witness to their divine power," on which, in particular on the universalizing influence of eastern divinities at Rome, see Turcan 1998, 181–182: "cette universalité ne contrarie pas en eux la qualité de dieux très personnels et constamment proches de leurs fidèles, ce qui les rends aussi d'autant plus exigeants…cette attitude, si foncièrement étrangère à la religion des vieux Romains, s'apparente à celle des dévots de la Déesse Syrienne, qui enchaînent à l'aveu des leurs péchés les douleurs endurées d'une véritable pénitence."

CHAPTER FIVE

SPACE, JUSTICE, AND THE LEGAL LIMITS OF EMPIRE: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF *FAS, IUS, LEX*, AND *VATES* IN *TR.* AND *PONT.*

ingenio tamen ipse meo comitorque fruorque:
Caesar in hoc potuit iuris habere nihil.

"I still continue to enjoy fully the power of my mind:
Caesar could have no right at all over this."

Tr. 3.7.47–48

In the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* Ovid often emphasizes his extreme geographical isolation in exile in order to draw attention to his physical absence from Rome.[1] At the same time, this allows him to create metaphorical distance—or what might be called intellectual space—between his place of exile and the center of the empire under Augustus. Because of the repeated emphasis on space in these poems, it is helpful to consider Ovid's relationship to the *princeps* there in terms of the space occupied by each. Augustus, for example, as both judge (*iudex*) and god (*deus / numen*) in the exile poetry, appears to occupy a space between *ius* "human right" and *fas* "divine right" within the sphere of Roman justice. This space is not entirely unlike the space the poet presents himself as inhabiting: Tomis, his place of exile, marks the legal limits of Roman *ius*, while *fas* helps him construct a poetic place for sacred speech. Of course, such neat, dichotomous divisions tend to oversimplify inevitable complexities; and the term *lex*, for example, clearly adds another dimension to Ovid's concern with justice. Nevertheless, at the risk of appearing overly schematic in my approach, I shall examine the distinction that Ovid draws between his place of exile and Augustus' control over the city of Rome in light of the terms *fas* and *ius*, the theoretical bases of Roman legal thought. The texts themselves will be

[1] E.g. *Tr.* 4.9.9: *sim licet extremum, sicut sum, missus in orbem* "Though banished, as I have been, to the farthest reaches of the world;" *Pont.* 2.7.66: *ultima me tellus, ultimus orbis habet* "I'm held at the end of the earth, at the end of the world." Cf. Hexter 2007, 211; Kettemann 1999, 722; and see above Ch. 1. 18–19 with nn. 11–12.

shown to invite such an approach because of a conceptual dichotomy that emerges over the course of the exile poetry between *fas* as the poet's right to speak before the gods and *ius* as the *princeps*' right to banish citizens from Rome. I shall thus consider the extent to which Ovid's adoption of the term *uates* for his role as speaker of divine knowledge provides a fitting counterbalance to Augustus' title of *iustus* as arbiter of Roman *ius*. To conclude, I shall reflect again on the figure of Caesar Germanicus, future *princeps* and current *uates*, as a potential bridge between the imperial household in Rome and the displaced poet in exile.

The terms *fas* and *ius* may be said to delimit, in the broadest sense, the beginnings of Roman legal thought.[2] Although a comprehensive analysis of *fas* and *ius* in Roman literature lies outside the scope of this study, it is nevertheless clear (even from the *Tristia* alone) that the words had multiple semantic values at the time of Ovid's exile. Thus, I want to avoid overly general assumptions about *fas* and *ius* in the language of Latin poetry and shall instead focus my analysis on individual appearances in Ovid's texts themselves. To start, however, I would like to consider at least one place in Vergil where the terms appear together to express a contrast between "divine law" (*fas*) and "human law" (*ius*), a semantic opposition generally associated with later usage but which I shall argue obtains in several passages from the exile poetry.[3] In the first book of the *Georgics*, we read that certain tasks of the farmer are sanctioned on religious holidays, 1.268–269: *quippe*

[2] Benveniste 1969, 133–134; Kaser 1967, 59–60; ib. 1949, 23–34; Latte 1950, 57. See *OLD* s.v. *fas* §1 "that which is right or permissible by divine law;" *OLD* s.v. *ius* §1 "That which is sanctioned or ordained, law."

[3] It used to be held generally that a neat opposition between *fas* as divine law and *ius* as human law had always existed, e.g. Wasser 1909 *RE* VI.2001. That view has since been revised, e.g. *NP* s.v. "*fas*" (F. Prescendi), and is thus summarized by Kaser 1967, 59–60: "Die geschichtlichen Anfänge des römischen Rechtsdenkens liegen bei den Begriffen *ius* und *fas*. Mit ihnen wird noch nicht, wie sehr viel später, ein Gegensatz zwischen zwei verschiedenen Ordnungen, dem menschlichen und dem göttlichen Recht, ausgedrückt, sondern beide beziehen sich auf die Erlaubtheit eines konkreten Verhaltens." The activity in our Vergil passage—farming—is no doubt concrete, although there may still be a problem with Kaser's phrase "sehr viel später," by which he means Aulus Gellius in the late 2nd cent. AD. For example, Latte 1950, 56, detected a change in the application of *fas* in Livy, who appears to have expanded its usage to cover "divine right" in the abstract; cf. Cipriano 1978, 16; Latte 1960, 38. This shift corresponds to a tendency among Romans to connect *ius* with the activity of the law court, that is, with the adjudication of what is right and wrong among men (not gods), cf. Kaser 1971, 26.

etiam festis quaedam exercere diebus / fas et iura sinunt "For it's a fact, on holidays you're actually allowed by gods' laws and by men's to attend to certain labours."[4] An oft-cited passage found in Vergil's early fifth-century commentator, Servius, attempts to make the meaning of the *Georgics* passage explicit, ad *G.* 1.269:

> 'fas et iura sinunt' id est divina humanaque iura permittunt: nam ad religionem fas, ad homines iura pertinent.
>
> "Allowed by gods' laws and by men's," that is, divine and human laws permit: for *fas* pertains to divine obligation, *iura* to men.

Although Servius can often be misleading or simply inaccurate, in this instance he appears to be right.[5] Indeed, Vergil employs *fas* and *ius* here to convey the notion—perhaps already inherently obvious to all—that there are different expectations and ways of behaving before gods and men. My contention in what follows is not that Ovid alludes directly to the *Georgics* passage in the exile poetry, but that Vergil establishes a precedent outside the language of formal prayer for juxtaposing *fas* and *ius* to express an identifiable contrast between divine and human law. Of course, a similar juxtaposition was not uncommon in the Roman comic poets, and indeed we find in Plautus, *Cist.* 20: *iusque fasque est* "right by divine and human law," and in Terence, *Hec.* 387: *per eam [Fortem Fortunam] te obsecramus ambae, si ius si fas est* "by that goddess we both beseech you, if the laws of men and gods allow."[6] The usage in Roman comedy is perhaps suggestive of a common joining of the two words in colloquial language or informal prayer, but it cannot be considered decisive for Ovid. The apparent contrast, however, found in Vergil's *Georgics*—and Servius' illuminating note—may shed light on the ways in which Ovid uses *fas* and *ius* in several passages from the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto*.

---

[4] For the sake of objectivity, I've used the translation of Peter Fallon, *The Georgics of Virgil* (Loughcrew, Co. Meath: 2004), 25.

[5] See Mynors 1990, 61, and also F. Sini in *EV* 2.466 on *fas* in *G.* 1.269: "dipende con molta probabilità l'identificazione del *f.* con la *lex divina* e la sua antitesi allo *ius*, *lex humana*, proposta da Isidoro (*Or.* 5.2.2: *fas lex diuina est, ius lex humana*)." Cf. Austin 1964, 81–82 (ad *A.* 2.157–159: *fas mihi Graiorum sacrata resoluere iura / fas odisse uiros … teneor patriae nec legibus ullis* "it is permitted for me to break my sworn oaths to the Greeks; it is permitted to hate them … I'm bound by no laws of my homeland"): "*fas est* implies not what is compulsory but what is allowable without transgressing the law of heaven."

[6] The usage in Plautus and Terence is called by Kaser 1949, 32, "tautologisch," but see parallel passages in *OLD* s.v. *fas* §3b. See also Cipriano 1978, 20–31, for a linguistic analysis of the difference in meaning, esp. 28 n. 34.

In the exile poetry generally Ovid often collocates *fas* with speaking, a familiar usage related to a well-known etymology recorded in Varro that connects *fas* with *fari*.[7] This same etymology seems to lie behind a verse of Vergil at *A.* 1.543: *deos memores fandi atque nefandi* "gods mindful of what may and what may not be spoken," and is implicit in the Latin word for calendar, *fasti*. That Ovid chose the Roman calendar as a subject for a poem just prior to his exile is perhaps significant in this regard and may very well involve more than merely pursuing indigenous Roman aetiologies on the Alexandrian poetic model.[8] In fact, Denis Feeney has argued that "Ovid's [*Fasti*] has an intense interest in the conditions of speech determined by the principate."[9] I would like to suggest that the poet carries this interest into exile and his last body of poems, being himself (at least in part) a casualty of his own words in the final phase of Augustus' rule.

By Ovid's own account, the *Ars Amatoria* was charged by the emperor for being indecent, *Tr.* 2.211–212: *turpi carmine factus / arguor obsceni doctor adulterii* "for a lewd poem I'm charged with having become a teacher of foul adultery." What makes a *carmen turpe*, of course, depends on the sensibility of the reader, though the poet says later in this letter that the *princeps* perceived the *Ars* to be a threat to his own marriage laws, 345–346:

> haec tibi me inuisum lasciuia fecit, ob *Artes*,
> quas ratus es uetitos sollicitare toros.

[7] Varr. *LL* 6.29–30: *dies fasti per quos praetoribus omnia uerba sine piaculo licet fari* ... *dies nefasti, per quos dies ne fas fari praetorem: do dico addico* "On *dies fasti* praetors are permitted to say all words without sin ... on *dies nefasti* it is not right for a praetor to say the formula: *do dico addico*." Cf. Bömer 1957, 36, and 1958, ad *Fast.* 1.45, on the formula *do dico addico*. In connection to *fas dicere*, cf. Cic. *Tusc.* 5.38: *humanus autem animus decerptus ex mente diuina cum alio nullo nisi cum ipso deo, si hoc fas est dictu, comparari potest* "but the human soul was taken from the divine mind and can be compared with nothing—if it is right to say—but god himself." On the two conflicting modern explanations of the etymological derivation for *fas*, cf. Ernout-Meillet, s.v., on which see Benveniste 1969, 134; Cipriano 1978, 29–30 with n. 38; *ib.* 23–27, on the etymology of *ius*.

[8] Green 1994, xvi, labels Ovid's enormous productivity on view in *Met.* and *Fast.* "the great unexamined mystery of Ovid's career." He speculates that the poet "may (as the subject matter of the *Fasti* and the flattery of the regime in the *Metamorphoses* both suggest) have been trying to repair the damage his earlier [*sc.* erotic] work had caused."

[9] Feeney 1992, 9. His title is important, "*Si licet et fas est*: Ovid's *Fasti* and the Problem of Free Speech under the Principate."

> This wantonness has made me hateful to you on account of my *Art of Love*, which you thought tempted the marriages you had protected by law.[10]

Thus the poem appears, more precisely, to have transgressed the legal limits of free speech, limits themselves known perhaps only to the emperor himself. Still later in the same poem the poet attempts to defend his *Ars* by comparing his own verse with the public spectacles put on at the emperor's expense, *Tr.* 2.509: *inspice ludorum sumptus, Auguste, tuorum* "consider the expenses of your own games, Augustus." Here, Ovid clarifies what in fact he means by *carmen turpe*, which is now tellingly cast in terms of *fas*, 2.515–516:

> scribere si fas est imitantes turpia mimos,
> materiae minor est debita poena meae.
>
> If it is right to compose mimes that imitate lewd behavior, then my subject matter deserves a lesser penalty.[11]

The term *fas* is being used here to frame a pious appraisal of what is right in poetry in relation to both the legal punishment (*poena*) Ovid received and, by extension, the very laws invoked to administer it, laws the *princeps* must have felt the *Ars* had transgressed.

In the *Ars* itself, however, *fas* never carries this meaning, as is likewise the case for the *Heroides*, although in both poems we meet the term but four times.[12] Given the far greater number of verses that combine to make up the *Fasti* and *Metamorphoses* and that at least one and perhaps both poems were revised by Ovid in exile,[13] it is not surprising that we catch a glimpse there of the significance the poet will ascribe to

[10] There is widespread agreement that these verses refer to the Augustan marriage laws of c. 18 BC, i.e. *lex Iulia de adulteriis coercendis* or *lex Iulia de maritandis ordinibus*, e.g. Owen 1924, 195; Berrino and Luisi 2002, 164–165; Ciccarelli 2003, 162; cf. Green 1994, xv–xvi, 340.

[11] The usage is perhaps reminiscent of *Am.* 2.13.27: *si tamen in tanto fas est monuisse timore* "if it is still right to have offered warning amid such great fear," which McKeown 1998, 293, calls "a carefully pious qualification to Ovid's warning to Corinna."

[12] *Ars* 1.739: *conquerar, an moneam mixtum fas omne nefasque?* "Shall I complain about or warn how right and wrong are all mixed up?" 3.151: *nec mihi tot positus numero comprendere fas est* "it's not possible for me to count up so many styles;" *Ep.* 3.5–6: *si mihi pauca queri de te dominoque uiroque / fas est* "If it is right for me to complain a bit about you, my lord and husband;" 4.134: *et fas omne facit fratre marita soror* "a sister made wife by a brother makes everything right;" thrice in the spurious epistle of Sappho, 15.63 (bis), 189.

[13] On possible post-exilic revisions of the *Metamorphoses*, see Richmond 2002, 472–474, and below n. 15; for the re-dedication of the *Fasti* in exile, see Herbert-Brown 1994, 173–185, 204–212; Fantham 1985, 256–266.

fas in the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto*.[14] In a critical passage from the end of the *Metamorphoses*, for example, the word carries the meaning it will have for several important passages in the exile poetry, *Met.* 15.867: *quosque alios* [sc. deos] *uati fas appellare piumque est* "and the other gods it is right and dutiful for the bard to call by name."[15] Here, what is *fas*, sanctioned by divine law, and *pium*, morally obligatory, is connected with the *uates* in his role as speaker. To him is vouchsafed the religious right to call on divinities by name in prayer.[16] In the first book of the *Fasti*, moreover, the term *fas* appears no fewer than four times[17] and may be said to furnish one of the guiding principles of the poem. Perhaps the clearest expression of what is *fas* there comes in the prologue to the sixth book, 6.3–8:

> facta canam; sed erunt qui me finxisse loquantur,
> nullaque mortali numina uisa putent.
> est deus in nobis, agitante calescimus illo;
> impetus hic sacrae semina mentis habet:
> fas mihi praecipue uoltus uidisse deorum,
> uel quia sum uates, uel quia sacra cano.

> I shall sing of what happened; but there will be those who say that I've made it up and who think that no gods have appeared to a mortal. Within me is a god whose stirring foments creativity and whose spur holds the seeds of sacred thought: it is right for me especially to have seen the faces of gods both because I'm a bard and because I sing of sacred rights.[18]

---

[14] The following figures—*fas* (12× *Met.*; 8× *Fast.*), *nefandus* (10× *Met.*; 3× *Fast.*), and *nefas* (22× *Met.*; 7× *Fast.*)—may be of interest for comparison (with n. 12), but the relevant passages appear in the text proper.

[15] Cf. Bömer 1986, ad 15.871ff.: "[hier beginnt] das Unheil der modernen Problematik von der Vermutung, dass … dieser Zusatz erst in der Verbannung geschrieben sei," with bibliography up to 1982 for both sides of the question. Add Kenney 1982, 444 n. 1: "It is possible that our text of the *Metamorphoses* goes back to a copy revised (like the *Fasti*) by Ovid in exile, and that one or two apparently 'prophetic' touches such as this (*Met.* 2.377–378) were introduced by him during revision. They are certainly striking, but hardly numerous enough for coincidence to be ruled out." For the striking linguistic parallels Kenney speaks of, cf. *Tr.* 3.7.45–54; 4.10.119–132 with *Met.* 15.871–879.

[16] On *si fas est* as part of the language of prayer, see Cipriano 1978, 46–47, under "La formula religiosa 'lecita'." *TLL* VI.1.288.51–82 "*in precationum formulis sollemnibus*," lists the *Met.* passage under discussion *and* Ov. *Tr.* 3.1.81; *Pont.* 2.8.37; *Fast.* 1.25; at *TLL* VI.1.293.68, under "*per religiones licet*" and "*latiore sensu*" appear *Pont.* 4.8.55; 4.16.45.

[17] *Fast.* 1.25, 329, 532, 629.

[18] This sentiment is seemingly reversed in the case of Vesta, *Fast.* 6.253–256: *non equidem uidi (ualeant mendacia uatum) / te, dea, nec fueras aspicienda uiro; / sed quae nescieram quorumque errore tenebar / cognita sunt nullo praecipiente mihi* "Of course, I myself did not see you, goddess (farewell to poets' lies!), nor were you meant to be looked upon by a

As in the passage from the *Metamorphoses* cited above, *fas* is used here in reference to the poet as *uates*, whose role Ovid defines as a singer of sacred rites.

In general, the priestly role of the *uates* derived from ancient Roman lore and had been revived by the Augustan poets of the generation before Ovid to invest the position of the poet at Rome with a certain degree of sacredness.[19] This appears to have grown out of a more general revival of the indigenous and arcane aspects of Roman antiquity conducted by Varro (and the *Varroniani*) around the middle of the first century BC that, as noted in the last chapter, produced the monumental *Antiquitates Rerum Diuinarum et Humanarum*. In the above passage from the *Fasti*, Ovid is playing upon the sacred status of the *uates* known from Horace in particular, for whom the figure represented an important member of the community because he was able to communicate with the divine.[20] The sacred role of the *uates*, especially his perceived ability to predict the future, becomes vital for Ovid in exile, and I shall have cause to revisit the topic in my discussion of the poet's marginalized position in Augustan society later in this chapter.

For now, however, it is important to note that Ovid does not associate the term *fas* with the sacred status of the *uates* from the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* until the final book of the *Tristia*; instead he uses it more generally in the early phase of his exile to define his position as poet in relation to the role of the *princeps* as upholder of the law in Rome. Thus in the second poem of the collection, *Tr.* 1.2, written ostensibly in the midst of a storm on board ship *en route* to his place of exile, Ovid introduces *fas* in a passage that defines his relationship to the *princeps* for the rest of the exilic corpus, 95–106:

et iubet et merui; nec, quae damnauerit ille [*sc. Caesar*],
    crimina defendi fasque piumque puto.
si tamen acta deos numquam mortalia fallunt,
    a culpa facinus scitis abesse mea.

---

mortal; but without any instruction I've come to know what had kept me in ignorance before."

[19] This is, in essence, the thesis of Newman 1967, which in its basic aspects is sound, though his reliance on the notion of a "concept" from his book's title leads him to misread Ovid, e.g. 109: "in spite of all appearances Ovid does not really understand the uates-concept at all." My own analysis of the exile poetry suggests that Ovid ably exploited the *uates*-figure even as it had been used by his Augustan predecessors. Of course, before the Augustan period, *uates* is used as a term of contempt in Ennius and Lucretius to mean superstitious quack and is roughly equivalent to *hariolus*.

[20] Cf. Brink 1982, 157, ad Hor. *Ep.* 2.1.119–138; and Lowrie 1997, 302.

immo ita si scitis, si me merus abstulit error,
stultaque, non nobis mens scelerata fuit,
quamlibet in minimis, domui si fauimus illi,
si satis Augusti publica iussa mihi,
hoc duce si dixi felicia saecula, proque
Caesare tura pius Caesaribusque dedi,
si fuit hic animus nobis, ita parcite diui:
si minus, alta nocens obruat unda caput.[21]

He issues the decree I have deserved; and the crimes that he's condemned I don't think it right and proper to be defended. If, however, the gods are never tricked by the acts of mortals, you know that a criminal deed plays no part in my transgression. If indeed you know this, if a mere mistake misled me when off my guard, and my mind was prone to folly, not criminality; if I've favored that house in even the most insignificant matters and Augustus' public commands were sufficient for me; if I've predicted ages of happiness under him as leader and offered incense in devotion to Caesar and the family of Caesars; if this has been my mindset, then, gods, be sparing of me: if not, let roll over my guilty head a tall wave from the sea.

I have already discussed why this passage is programmatic for Ovid's representation of his legal status in exile,[22] and I would like now to focus more closely on the juxtaposition of *fas* and *ius*. The verb *iubeo* from the passage's beginning, for example, can be connected with the legal decree issued by Augustus in his capacity as arbiter of *ius*.[23] The emperor is even called here *iudex* or "judge" (64), the literal meaning of which is of course "speaker of the law" (*ius* and *dicere*). At the same time, Ovid's refusal to speak in defense of his own *crimina* is framed as an act that adheres to divine law and moral obligation, *fasque piumque* (96).

It must be remembered that the technical terms of the law that the poet uses here to define both what his fault was (*culpa / error*) and what

[21] This text diverges from Wheeler and Goold 1988 at 99: Camps' *merus* for ms. *meus*; and 106: Heinsius' *nocens* for ms. *cadens*.

[22] Above 42, 58–59. For Bernhardt 1986, 79–80, the passage is programmatic for the general type of "Hilfesuche" common to the plaintive poet in exile.

[23] Cf. *Tr.* 2.132: *iussa fuga est* "exile was decreed;" 4.1.19: *me quoque Musa leuat Ponti loca iussa petentem* "I too have been comforted by the Muse in heading for my appointed region on the Black Sea." On Ovid's "emphatic use of the verb 'iubeo'," see Syme 1978, 222–223; *iubeo* was a technical term used in legal decrees, see *OLD* s.v. *iubeo* §5 and cf. *TLL* VII.2.581.63–64, and was associated with the term *ius* in the formula *ius iubendi* or "the right of magistrates to issue orders, particularly in their jurisdictional activity" (Berger 1953, *Iubere*). Ovid brings the two terms together in the *Heroides*, in the final couplet of Briseis' letter to Achilles, where she bids, *Ep.* 3.153–154: *me modo … domini iure uenire iube* "by the right you have as lord, bid me now to come."

it was not (*facinus / scelus*) are presented in terms of his personal relationship with Augustus (see above Ch. 2 42–44). The importance of that relationship becomes evident when the house Ovid claims personally to have favored, the house of the Caesars, is represented as being in control of the legal procedure of the city (*Augusti publica iussa*). Augustus' power over the law appears to influence the progression of the prayer, as if from the outset of his exile poetry Ovid was keen to underscore the tight nexus between religious ritual and legal acts at Rome. Indeed, the prayer starts as an appeal to the gods of the sea and heaven (59) but ends with the poet recognizing that the actual source of his salvation is the family of the divine Caesars towards whom he professes to have shown pious devotion (104). The combination *fasque piumque* defines the parameters, first, for what it is right to say (and keep silent) about the crime and, further, for which gods it is right to venerate in prayer. A similar usage of the term *fas* in connection with both the language of prayer and the nature of the crime appears in Ovid's autobiographical poem from the fourth book of the *Tristia*. There the poet prays to the divine shades of his parents and clarifies the legal status of his exile, *Tr.* 4.10.89–90:

> scite, precor, causam—nec uos mihi fallere fas est[24]—
> errorem iussae, non scelus, esse fugae.

> Know, I pray—for it is not right for me to deceive you—that the cause of my banishment was a mistake, not a crime.

Again, the *crimen* is referred to as an *error* (private wrong) rather than a *scelus* (public crime), and as in *Tr.* 1.2, *fas* serves to define a sphere of religious propriety within which speaking is controlled and contradicting the *princeps* is viewed as a crime against a god.[25]

---

[24] In my analysis of *fas* I have considered its appearances in combination with *non* or *nec* and the equivalent *nefas*. *Nefas* appears five times in the exile poetry and provides one possible parallel for the present discussion, *Tr.* 2.337–338 (on the singing of Caesar's deeds): *et tamen ausus eram; sed detrectare uidebar, / quodque nefas, damno uiribus esse tuis* "and yet I ventured it; but perhaps I belittled the matter and—what a crime!—diminished your power." It is also used to define what Ovid's offense was not, *Pont.* 2.2.15–16 (to Messalinus): *est mea culpa grauis, sed quae me perdere solum / ausa sit, et nullum maius adorta nefas* "my mistake is serious, but one which dared to destroy me alone without attempting a greater crime;" cf. *Tr.* 4.10.101; *Pont.* 1.9.3; 4.11.18.

[25] A similar case can be made for the meaning of Ovid's second use of *fas*, *Tr.* 2.205–206: *fas prohibet Latio quemquam de sanguine natum / Caesaribus saluis barbara uincla pati* "Right forbids that anyone of Latin blood suffer foreign bondage while Caesars live." As in *Tr.* 1.2, the Caesars as gods offer the protection of divine law, now however not just to Ovid but to anyone of Italian stock.

Ovid's use of *fas* in the language of prayer is hardly remarkable; for the term traditionally governs a sacral sphere of speaking before the gods, such as those the Caesars have become in the exile poetry. It is noteworthy, however, that Ovid appears to be using *fas* here to establish his own divine right as a poet in exile over against the divine right of the *princeps* in Rome.[26] The word, it seems, has the immediate effect of adding a veneer of religious solemnity to his prayers in *Tr.* 1.2 and 4.10; more generally, it helps him to carve out a sacred position for himself as poet vis-à-vis the godlike Augustus, whose very name implies something sacred and worthy of veneration.[27] In contrast to the *princeps*' mute divinity however, Ovid's sacred poet is full of words, and the traditional association of *fas* with speaking refigures indirectly. To be sure, the poet's concern with *fas* and its connection to acts of speech can also be playful, a kind of pun on the inherent meaning of the word, which he is allowed to say over and over despite the legal strictures placed on his physical whereabouts. At the same time, the term *fas* is clearly useful to his self-representation in exile insofar as it furnishes him with access to language that signifies itself as "sacred."

Even as he employs *fas* to construct a self-consciously sacred identity for himself in exile, Ovid continues to use the word in the sense of "right (to say)" within the language of formal prayer. This is especially true of the conditional *si fas est*, which itself derives from a common religious formula used in the invocation of gods.[28] For example, in *Tr.* 3.1 the personification of Ovid's bookroll seeks divine help through prayer, 77–82:

---

[26] Of course, *fas* does not always mean "divine right" but can indicate possibility (*OLD* s.v. §3c), e.g. *Tr.* 2.213–214: *fas ergo est aliqua caelestia pectora falli, / et sunt notitia multa minora tua* "it is possible that some divine minds be deceived: for many things are beneath your notice." Cf. *Tr.* 3.12.41–42: *fas quoque ab ore freti longaeque Propontidos undis / huc aliquem certo uela dedisse Noto* "it is possible too that from the strait's mouth and waters of the distant Propontis someone has set sail with a steady south wind," where for Cipriano 1978, 66 n. 28, the sense of *fas* is "probabile" as in *Fast.* 1.329–330: *fas etiam fieri solitis aetate priorum / nomina de ludis Graeca tulisse diem* "it may even be that the day (sc. *Agon*) took its Greek name from the games that used to be held in our ancestors' time."

[27] *OLD* s.v. *augustus*[1] §1–2; Jolowicz and Nicholas 1972, 343; and see above Ch. 4 103 with n. 43.

[28] Cipriano 1978, 46, reproduces the formula: *si hoc nomine te fas est inuocare* "if it is right to call you by this name."

"di, precor, atque adeo—neque enim mihi turba roganda est—
Caesar, ades uoto, maxime diue, meo!
interea, quoniam statio mihi publica clausa est,
priuato liceat delituisse loco.
uos quoque, si fas est, confusa pudore repulsae
sumite plebeiae carmina nostra manus."

"Gods, I pray, and especially Caesar, greatest divine being—for I need not ask a holy throng—look favorably upon my prayer. As long as a shelf in the public library is denied to me, let it be permitted in the interim to go unnoticed in a private place. If it is right, you too, hands of the people, take up our poems suffused with the shame of rejection."

Caesar Augustus is in fact the only god necessary to name because he is represented as the greatest, *maxime diue* (78). Ovid is evidently using the term *fas* here—its fourth appearance thus far—to maintain the pseudo-solemnity of the religious invocation, while also implying a contrast between his own forlorn status as exile and the exalted status of the divine Caesar in Rome. This contrast is observable in the above passage's shift in emphasis from *maximus diuus Caesar*, who has physically banned Ovid from the public places he himself controls, to the private individuals in Rome who will read these poems. Notably, the *princeps* is again associated with the public sphere: his presence there has caused the official libraries to ban Ovid's work and forced his bookroll to look for a spot on a private shelf (79–80). The movement from public to private that Ovid has his bookroll undergo here applies more broadly to his poetic œuvre in exile. He no longer writes love poems celebrated throughout the city (e.g. *Am* 3.11.19–20, cf. *Tr.* 4.10.59–60) or aetiological poems on important public documents like the calendar (*Fasti*); instead, he occupies himself in large part with private letters. Yet even here the private letter of personal complaint becomes in fact a public lament wherein he exhorts the people in Rome to take note of his shame (81–82). Thus, a disjunction between the surface and the essence of the exile poetry comes once more into view: Ovid's crime appears to have been a private wrong but was in actuality punished in a highly public fashion; his poems appear to be private letters to select individuals but could in fact have been read by any literate Roman with the means to acquire them.

Because these poems repeatedly emphasize Ovid's geographical separation from Rome, we may justifiably conceive of this disjunction in spatial terms as *lateral*; for it captures the physical difference between inside (private) and outside (public). The separation, at once literal

and figurative, between private and public may in turn be related to a semantic dichotomy between the terms *fas* and *ius* that appears to emerge in the *Tristia*'s final book, *Tr.* 5.2. If we consider the problem once again spatially, the determinant contrast is at first glance *vertical*; for Ovid's speech accords with *fas*, "divine or heavenly right," while his punishment is meted out in accordance with *ius*, "human or earthly right." The poem itself starts as a letter to his wife and turns into an open invocation of Augustus.[29] Ovid employs here the lofty language of prayer to address the *princeps* as Jupiter on high, *Tr.* 5.2.45–48, 53–54:

> alloquor en absens absentia numina supplex,
> si fas est homini cum Ioue posse loqui.
> arbiter imperii, quo certum est sospite cunctos
> Ausoniae curam gentis habere deos...
> parce, precor, minimamque tuo de fulmine partem
> deme: satis poenae, quod superabit, erit.

> In my absence, behold as a suppliant, I address absent deities, if it is right for a mortal to speak with Jupiter. O arbiter of the empire, on whose life depends all other gods' care for the Ausonian race ... be sparing, I pray, and take away just the slightest bit of your thunderbolt: enough punishment will be left over.

The poet assumes the status of a lowly suppliant to whom it may be permitted by divine law to address the heavenly god on whose will both his punishment and salvation depend. Though *fas* allows Ovid to speak his prayer before a god, his legal status is nevertheless expressed in terms of *ius*, 55–56:

> ira quidem moderata tua est, uitamque dedisti,
> nec mihi ius ciuis nec mihi nomen abest.

> Your anger has in fact been tempered, and you have granted life, and I do not lack the right of calling myself a citizen.

In attempting to understand the significance of both *fas* and *ius* in these passages it helps to remember that Augustus appears to have circumvented due process of the law and acted as *iudex* himself in deciding on the punishment for Ovid's alleged crimes (above Ch. 2 38). Regarding his punishment, the poet expresses gratitude—a bitterly ironic show of thanks—because the imperial edict specified that he was relegated, not exiled (57–58), and thus, in view of the possibilities, mildly

[29] I agree with Heinsius, Luck, and Hardie 2002a, 300 n. 43, that the poem need not be divided after v. 45 as most editors see fit to do; see above 86 n. 70.

punished. In keeping with the paradoxical position he adopts elsewhere in these poems, Ovid continues to insist here upon his guilt, 59: *omnia quae timui, quia me meruisse uidebam* "I feared all these things because I saw I deserved them," and even claims to welcome suffering, though preferably not in Tomis, 77–78:

> quod petimus, poena est: neque enim miser esse recuso,
> sed precor ut possim tutius esse miser.
>
> What I'm asking for is punishment: for I don't even refuse to be wretched, but pray that I may be wretched more safely.

Thus, in addition to the conceptual contrast between heaven and earth—god and man—implicit in Ovid's use of the terms *fas* and *ius* found here, *Tr.* 5.2 also provides overlap on three interrelated problems that have occupied us in this study so far. First, the poet's careful concern for the legal status of his transgression subtly suggests that his punishment was excessive: public exile for an apparently private *error*. The immediate imbalance of power in their relationship then leads to Ovid's humble deference to the *princeps* as a god, a unique divinity he first creates in verse, then appears to accept at spurious face-value. And finally, as part of this rhetorical posturing, Ovid's professed desire to suffer without having admitted to a serious offense effectively implies that the true nature of the *princeps*' power lies in his ability to exact guilt from the accused merely for having been accused. Ultimately, all three of these problems depend on Augustus' preeminent power in these poems, a power most like to Jupiter's in heaven. What the poet presents himself as saying before Rome's divine ruler in *Tr.* 5.2 accords with *fas*, while what he is forced to do on the ground is expressed in terms of *ius*. If we examine this contrast more closely, we shall see that *ius* applies more generally to Augustus' legal control in Rome and, in effect, to the spatial limits of her empire, while *fas* helps to create a poetic space in which Ovid determines what it is right to say.

Ius, Lex, *and the Limits of Rome*

In the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* Ovid often deploys the term *ius*—and its complement *lex*—when considering his exile in relation to the physical extent of the Roman empire. This can be seen for the first time in his open letter to the *princeps*, *Tr.* 2.199: *haec* [terra] *est Ausonio sub iure novissima* "this land is the most recent to come under Roman

rule."[30] The Roman rule explicit in the term *ius* connects this passage to a similar one from the last book of exilic poems in which Ovid acclaims the military exploits of a certain Vestalis on the shores of Pontus, *Pont.* 4.7.1–2:

> Missus es Euxinas quoniam, Vestalis, ad undas,
> ut positis reddas iura sub axe locis.
>
> Given that you, Vestalis, have been sent to the waters of the Black Sea in order to administer justice in territory situated under the pole.

Here the word *iura* appears in the sense of "justice," a meaning that also obtains, for example, in Ovid's characterization of Tomis as a lawless place, *Tr.* 5.7.47–48:

> non metuunt leges, sed cedit uiribus aequum,
> uictaque pugnaci iura sub ense iacent.
>
> They don't fear laws, but right yields to force, and justice lies conquered under the sword of the aggressor.

The term *lex* stands in support of *iura* here and acts as a kind of surrogate for justice in the form of non-specific legislation.[31] These *leges* need no names and merely signify "Roman law" in the abstract. In the

[30] Cf. Gärtner 1999, 797, on *Pont.* 2.1.23–24: *quaeque capit uastis inmensum moenibus orbem, / hospitiis Romam uix habuisse locum.* "Rome, which receives the immeasurable world within her vast walls, scarcely had room for her guests."

[31] In the Latin language generally and in the exile poetry in particular, *lex* means primarily "a statute, law, passed in the way legally prescribed by the competent legislative organs" (Berger 1953, *Lex*), which may be contrasted with the broadest sense of *ius* as "the whole of the law, the laws ... without regard to the source from which they emanate" (Berger 1953, *Ius*). Indeed, on a theoretical level *lex* properly belongs to a sub-category of *ius*, as in Cic. *Part.* 129: *(ius) diuiditur in duas primas partes, naturam atque legem* "*ius* is divided into two main parts: nature and law;" cf. *TLL* VII.2.1238.78–1239.75; *OLD* s.v. *lex* §1–2, e.g. Cic. *inv.* 2.162: *lege ius est quod in eo scripto, quod populo expositum est ut observet, continetur* "statute law is what is contained in a written document which is published for the people to observe" (trans. H.M. Hubbell [Loeb 1949]). For this sense of *lex* in the exile poetry, see *Tr.* 2.233–234: *urbs quoque te et legum lassat tutela tuarum / et morum* "you're also wearied by the city and overseeing the laws you made and habits," where the *leges* clearly refer to the statutes Augustus had passed, cf. Luck 1977, ad loc.; and Ciccarelli 2003, 172, on the combination *leges et mores*. Elsewhere in reference to statutes, *Tr.* 2.243; 5.7.47; 5.9.31 (*lex* imposed by Caesar); *Pont.* 1.1.22; 2.9.71: *nec quicquam, quod lege uetor committere, feci* "and I did nothing I'm forbidden by law to do," 3.3.56–57; 4.9.94; 4.14.54; 4.15.12 (Caesar's laws); or more general rules and precepts, e.g. *Tr.* 2.488; 5.3.25; *Ib.* 616; *Pont.* 4.12.5 (metrical rule). In at least one place, however, *lex* seems to cover "right" in a general sense, *Pont.* 4.6.33: *cum tibi suscepta est legis uindicta seuerae* "when you've taken up the punishing of strict justice," although this passage refers not to Augustus, but to the Brutus who may have been charged with publishing *Pont.* 1–3; see Syme 1978, 80.

present poem they serve to underpin the emperor's control of what is right and, more broadly, of civil order among men.

In contradistinction to Rome, where laws continue to prevail because the figure of the *princeps* virtually embodies the principle of justice (*iura*), Tomis lacks entirely the rule of law, *Tr.* 5.10.43–44:

> adde quod iniustum rigido ius dicitur ense,
> dantur et in medio uulnera saepe foro.
>
> Add that justice is dispensed unjustly by means of the stiff sword and that they often deal each other wounds in the middle of the forum.

The utter lack of law and civil order is a telling feature of Ovid's characterization of Tomis as a negative image of Rome; for Augustus' physical absence signals a corresponding absence of his legal control over men there.[32] Thus, in the final book of his exilic collection, after nearly a decade of being forced to experience what he characterizes as perilous living conditions, the poet can write of Tomis, *Pont.* 4.9.93b–4: *. . . hic, ubi barbarus hostis, / ut fera plus ualeant legibus arma, facit* "here, where the barbarian enemy makes savage arms worth more than laws." Ovid is doubtless exaggerating here for poetic effect—his description may even be wholly facetious—yet the term *lex* is nevertheless acting again as the practical extension of Roman imperial *ius*, whose absence in Tomis makes for a kind of dire dystopia. At the same time, the representation of the dysfunctional legal circumstances of his place of exile does not merely win pity for the poet on the margin of the civilized world, but rather highlights a fundamental difference between Tomis and Rome: the presence of the *princeps* in Rome brings order to the city and control to himself; his absence from Tomis makes for a dangerous state of rampant lawlessness, which nevertheless leaves the poet to his own devices. Put another way, Ovid's absence from Rome allows him to occupy a space—the poetic world of Tomis—that lies on the edge of and perhaps beyond the legal rule of the empire and the control of the *princeps*.

Above all, the terms *ius* and *lex* serve to specify Ovid's status as exile in relation to the laws of the city of Rome. This is readily observable

---

[32] Cf. Grebe 2004, 117–119; Claassen 1987, 35 (with n. 19): "The poet's consistent portrayal of the warlike aspect of his place of exile, which does not share in the *pax Augusta*, not only negates many of the emperor's political claims in the *Res Gestae*, but perhaps also shows his powerlessness to implement peace in his capacity as saviour-god of the Roman state."

in *Tr.* 4.9, a poem of reproach to an unspecified detractor, who is reminded that Ovid is still a Roman citizen and thus afforded certain rights, 11: *omnia, si nescis, Caesar mihi iura reliquit* "Caesar, in case you're unaware, has left to me all my rights."[33] Again, it is the *princeps* who controls Ovid's rights as a citizen (*iura*) and acts as the ultimate arbiter of the poet's legal status in the city. Roman citizenship is of course still useful to Ovid in exile insofar as it allows him and his family to keep his property, as he writes in a memorable letter to his wife, *Tr.* 5.11.15: *nec uitam nec opes nec ius mihi ciuis ademit* "he has not taken from me life, nor property, nor the right of citizenship." Although Augustus is the one most immediately responsible for Ovid's geographical separation from the city, the poet still casts his right to citizenship—indeed the very fact that he is alive!—as a gift from the emperor for using the term *relegatus* and not *exul* in the imperial edict (*Tr.* 5.11.21–22; cf. *Tr.* 2.237–238). By drawing on the legal language of the edict here, Ovid deepens the contrast between Tomis and Rome: in the one, law has no place and right yields to violence; in the other, the rights of the citizen (*ius ciuis*) are upheld precisely because of the predominant presence of Augustus there. In metaphorical terms, the *princeps*' legal control over the running of the Roman state effectively forces the poet, an alleged transgressor of the law, out of the city. There is, in essence, no more room for Ovid in Augustan Rome, and the space he occupies in exile is naturally devoid of Roman *ius*.

Fittingly, the "right of return" to Rome is also expressed in terms of *ius*. This is perhaps most evident in *Pont.* 3.4, a poem about the commemorative piece Ovid tells Rufinus he wrote in honor of Tiberius' victory over Germany in 13 AD.[34] There the poet explains that because

[33] One could also argue that *ius* has a similar meaning in *Tr.* 4.4.43: *ergo ut iure damus poenas* "Thus I am legitimately punished," but perhaps a more simple interpretation of *iure* as "rightly" is preferable as Gaertner 2005 has pointed out ad *Pont.* 1.2.148: "in Ovid's day the original legal meaning of *iure* is largely diluted," e.g. *Tr.* 2.13; *Pont.* 1.9.41, 43; 3.4.38; 3.6.41, and probably *Pont.* 2.2.19–20 [to Messalinus, whose anger was justified like Caesar's]: *esse quidem fateor meritam post Caesaris iram / difficilem precibus te quoque iure meis* "Indeed, I admit that after I earned Caesar's anger you too were rightly unsympathetic to my entreaties." The meaning of *iure* in *Tr.* 2.37–38: *iure igitur genitorque deum rectorque uocatur / iure capax mundus nil Ioue maius habet*, is "truly," as Owen 1924 translates: "he is truly called the sire and ruler of the Gods; the wide universe truly contains naught greater," and Luck 1967 renders "mit recht." Finally, in *Pont.* 1.7.60 and 4.8.9 *ius* means simply "bond of family / friendship," cf. *OLD* s.v. *ius* §9. On *Pont.* 2.5.71 in connection to *sacra*, see below 154 n. 68, 161.

[34] Syme 1978, 53.

his book contains the praise of a member of the imperial family it retains a special right to enter Rome, 15–16:

> cunctaque cum mea sint propenso nixa fauore,
> praecipuum ueniae ius habet ille liber.

> Though all my work rests on kindly favor, that book has a special right of indulgence.

The right of the book to enter the city depends on *ius*, the term that Ovid associates with Augustus in his particular role as *iudex* in deciding upon the punishment for his crime and in his larger role as enactor of Rome's *leges*.[35] Similarly, the right of the poet himself to return to the city—if not physically, then at least through his imagination—also depends on *ius*. The best way of return is of course by means of letters, and again it cannot be stressed enough how perfectly adapted to Ovid's predicament in exile the epistolary form is: the poet cannot physically be in Rome, but he is able to make his presence felt there through his poems; he is at once absent and present.[36] This idea takes on special significance in the second poem from *Tristia* 4, in which Ovid recreates in verse the rites of Tiberius' triumph over Germany, *Tr.* 4.2.55–62:

> inde petes arcem et delubra fauentia uotis,
> et dabitur merito laurea uota Ioui.
> haec ego summotus qua possum mente uidebo:
> erepti nobis ius habet illa loci;
> illa per inmensas spatiatur libera terras,
> in caelum celeri peruenit illa fuga;
> illa meos oculos mediam deducit in urbem,
> immunes tanti nec sinit esse boni.

> Then you will seek the citadel and the shrines that favor prayers, and the votive laurel will be dedicated deservingly to Jupiter. Although I have been sent away, I shall see these things with my mind, my only means

[35] The view that the *princeps* was in control of the law is implicit in the studies of Augustan legal procedure by Mommsen 1952, 2.844; Jones 1960, 3, 17; and Jolowicz and Nicholas 1972, 342–344; cf. *OCD*^{3} s.v. "Augustus," 218 (N. Purcell).

[36] Cf. *Tr.* 5.1.79–80: *cur scribam, docui. cur mittam, quaeritis, isto? / uobiscum cupio quolibet esse modo* "I've told you why I write, but you ask why send them to you: I wish to be with you any way I can." The importance of the form of the letter to Ovid's exile poetry has often been recognized, e.g. Gaertner 2007a, 168–172; Holzberg 1998, 188, on *Tr.* 3.2; Rosenmeyer 1997; Helzle 1989, 19–21; Davisson 1985, 240–246, on *Tr.* 5.13; and Claassen 1999, 12, on *sermo absentis*. Philip Hardie has dedicated a book to *Ovid's Poetics of Illusion* (2002), and his words on our next poem for analysis, *Tr.* 4.2, are apt, 308: "Ovid's mind is as free as that of the exiled Pythagoras, or of Lucretius' triumphant Epicurus, to roam where it will."

> of seeing them: that still holds the right to the place which has been snatched away; that wanders freely through immeasurable lands and enters into heaven on its swift flight; that leads my eyes into the middle of Rome and does not allow them to miss so great a good.

The poet's claim to retain his right to enter the city (*ius loci*) by means of his imagination makes up a critical part of his poetic response to the *princeps*' control of the legal workings of the Roman state. Ovid's mind (*mens*) defies his physical ban and sets in motion here a disembodied rejoinder in verse to his punishment of exile, for which he was apparently never given the right to legal redress. Without recourse to actual appeal, the poet is forced to rely on poetry and the figurative mode of response that found its final form in many of his verse-letters from exile. There Ovid invests his now marginalized art with a redressive capacity to establish a creative right that resists political oppression and retains its imaginative freedom (59: *mens libera*).

A similar idea, in a notably similar poem, recurs at the end of the exilic corpus in *Pont.* 4.9, which I cited at the very outset of this study to point up Ovid's ability to lay claim to the power of poetry to circumvent his punishment and thus challenge the evident legal authority of the *princeps*.[37] There the poet imagines himself in Rome among those in attendance on the Capitoline celebrating the sacred rites as Graecinus assumes the consulship in 16 AD, 35–36:

> hic ego praesentes inter numerarer amicos,
> mitia ius Vrbis si modo fata darent.

> In such circumstances I would be counted among friends of yours in attendance, if only the mild fates would grant me the right to be in Rome.

The power of the mind, *mens*, is again a necessary component for the "right to travel," 39–44:[38]

> non ita caelitibus uisum est, et forsitan aequis.
> nam quid me poenae causa negata iuuet?
> mente tamen, quae sola loco non exulat, utar,
> praetextam fasces aspiciamque tuos.

[37] The *princeps* here is, of course, Tiberius, whose dogged adherence to Augustan precedent is well known. The present analysis is concerned with the contrast on view between *poeta* and *princeps*, whether Tiberius or Augustus is not as important as the fact that the emperor is still the legal arbiter of Ovid's exile.

[38] The emphasis Ovid places on the power of his mind, or *oculus mentis*, is analyzed by Nagle 1980, 92–100. See also Newlands 1997, on Ovid's imaginary "grand tour" of Rome; Walker 1997, 196; and more generally Rosati 1979, 110–111 with n. 16.

haec modo te populo reddentem iura uidebit,
  et se decretis[39] finget adesse tuis.

The gods have decided otherwise, and perhaps they are just. For how would I benefit from denying that there is a reason for my punishment? Yet I shall use my mind, which alone is not in physical exile, and behold your consular robe and fasces. My mind will see you administering justice to the people and will imagine that it is itself present at your public decrees.

The notion that Ovid's mind—and specifically *not* his body—is privy to the consul's juridical procedure neatly complements the distinction made above between the rampant lawlessness of Tomis and the imperial law manifestly in place in Rome: the exile's body is subject to hardship and violence, while his mind is left free to wander, unbeholden to law and unfettered by physical constraints. The power of the poet's creative imagination (*ingenium*), especially as it contrasts with the controlling power of the *princeps*' rule of the city (*ius*), is most clearly expressed in an oft-cited passage from *Tr.* 3.7, a poem to an aspiring *uates* back in Rome whom Ovid calls Perilla, 47–48:

ingenio tamen ipse meo comitorque fruorque:
  Caesar in hoc potuit iuris habere nihil.

I still continue to enjoy fully the power of my mind: Caesar could have no right at all over this.

Here, *ius* is being used in a transferred sense to mean "control" (*OLD* s.v. § 13b); but the legal implications of the word, in particular its connection with Augustus' control of the city of Rome, cannot be ignored in the face of Ovid's predicament in exile. There is, moreover, a crucial interpretive point to be made here: the poet sets the creative power invested in him by his *ingenium* over against the legal power in *ius* that the *princeps* exercises as arbiter of the law at Rome.

The legal right of Augustus to banish Ovid according to the terms of *ius* and, by extension, *lex* stands in sharp and consistent contrast to the poet's own power to write poetry that springs from his *ingenium*. This was, after all, a determinant cause of his banishment, as Ovid notes in the epitaph he composes for himself in exile, *Tr.* 3.3.73–74:

[39] Korn's emendation for *secretis*, acknowledged by Richmond 1990 and printed by Wheeler and Goold 1988, jibes better with the very public activities that precede and follow, e.g. 45–46: *nunc longi reditus hastae supponere lustri / credet, et exacta cuncta locare fide* "now my mind will believe that you're putting up for sale the five-year tax revenues and contracting for everything with scrupulous good faith."

hic ego qui iaceo tenerorum lusor amorum
  ingenio perii Naso poeta meo.

Here I lie, now come to ruin by my own poetic genius, Naso, the frivolous poet of tender loves.[40]

When faced with the power of the imaginative freedom in a poet such as Ovid, *ius* meets its limits. In terms of the conceptual dichotomy outlined above between the divine right of the poet to speak, *fas*, and the human right of the *princeps* to exile, *ius*, Ovid's claim to be himself responsible for his own downfall amounts to an assertion that his poetic talent (*ingenium*) is immediately more capacious than legal decrees enacted at Rome. In fact, as the poet notes in the very first poem from the exilic collection, exile was his own doing, *Tr.* 1.1.56: *ingenio sic fuga parta meo* "thus was exile caused by my own poetic talent." A similar notion is repeated two books later, *Tr.* 3.10.78: *haec est in poenam terra reperta meam* "this land has been discovered for my punishment." If we accept—as we should—these dramatic statements of poetic power, the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* become themselves a kind of literary fiction, the vivid creation of Ovid's inventive intellect. For in their present form, these poems reflect less the reality of the exile's ills than the poet's right to create an imaginative space from which to comment on, for example, the justice of his exile or the changing shape of the religious, legal, and literary culture of Rome under Augustus. This is not to diminish the very real, physical and psychological suffering of a forced separation from home, but rather to remember that Ovid's reaction to his punishment as we have it was poetic, a highly stylized literary response that readily exploited the rhetorical capacity of metaphor and the figured speech of verse. If, as I have begun to argue, *fas* helps to define that speech and to bestow upon it a sacred aura, it also helps to construct a poetic sphere in which the creative *ingenium* of the exiled Ovid can be realized. Even if *ius* keeps him away from Rome with no immediate, legal recourse, *fas* ultimately becomes a more empowering concept that allows the poet to continue being a poet; for continuing to speak and to write verse must always be his most essential right, without which he

[40] See Herescu 1958, 442, and above Intro. 13 n. 45; and below Ch. 5 166 n. 94 on similar such passages, e.g. *Tr.* 4.1.35–36: *nos quoque delectant, quamuis nocuere, libelli, / quodque mihi telum uulnera fecit, amo* "I too like my books, though they've brought me harm, and love the weapon that has wounded me;" *Pont.* 3.5.4: *laesus ab ingenio Naso poeta suo* "the poet Naso injured by his own talent."

simply ceases to exist. As we shall see below in analyzing the term *uates*, the point of linking the poet's task to *fas* is indeed existential and helps to frame Ovid's response to his exile as a defense of the art of poetry itself. There is, moreover, at least one other consequence of the poet's recourse to *fas* over *ius*: Augustus is a god in the exile poetry not only because the state will make him one by senatorial decree (*ius*)—already an accomplished fact in *Pont.* 4.9—but also because Ovid has the divine right to say he is (*fas*).

That the poet is keen to exploit the semantic contrast between *fas* and *ius* is supported by his application of the epithet *iustus* to Augustus in several key passages.[41] On the most basic level, the *princeps* is called *iustus* in the exile poetry because he upholds *ius* in Rome, the right the poet must himself do without on the shores of Pontus. The title *iustus* (or even *iustissimus*, *Pont.* 1.2.99) for Augustus is perhaps most familiar from the end of the *Metamorphoses*, 15.832–837:

> pace data terris animum ad ciuilia uertet
> iura suum legesque feret iustissimus auctor
> exemploque suo mores reget inque futuri
> temporis aetatem uenturorumque nepotum
> prospiciens prolem sancta de coniuge natam
> ferre simul nomenque suum curasque iubebit.

> Once peace has been given to the world he will turn his attention to the rights of the citizens and will introduce laws as the most righteous authority and by his own example will govern morality and, looking forward to a future era and his descendants to come, will issue a decree that the offspring born from his sacred wife take at the same time both his name and his responsibilities.

As in the exile poetry, the term *iustus* is associated here with Augustus' control of *ius*, in addition to *leges* and *mores*, and with his right to issue imperial decrees (*iubeo*). A similar idea can be found in a passage from *Tristia* 4 in a letter of thanks for the loyalty shown by a noble friend,[42] *Tr.* 4.4.9–20:

---

[41] E.g. *Pont.* 1.2.97–98: *di faciant igitur, quorum iustissimus ipse est, / alma nihil maius Caesare terra ferat* "So may the gods, of whom Caesar himself is the most just, see to it that mother earth bears nothing greater than him." Note that not every instance of *iustus* in *Tr.* and *Pont.* refers to Augustus, but I've gathered all those that do in the text proper and n. 44.

[42] This steadfast friend is likely to be Messallinus, the addressee of *Pont.* 1.7 and 2.2 and older son of M. Valerius Messalla Corvinus, cf. Syme 1978, 122.

nil ego peccaui; tua te bona cognita produnt.
si, quod es, appares, culpa soluta mea est.
nec tamen officium nostro tibi carmine factum
principe tam iusto posse nocere puto.
ipse pater patriae—quid enim est ciuilius illo?—
sustinet in nostro carmine saepe legi,
nec prohibere potest, quia res est publica Caesar,
et de communi pars quoque nostra bono est.
Iuppiter ingeniis praebet sua numina uatum,
seque celebrari quolibet ore sinit.
causa tua exemplo superorum tuta duorum est,
quorum hic aspicitur, creditur ille deus.

I've done nothing wrong: you're betrayed by your well-attested goodness; I'm absolved of blame, if you appear to be what in fact you are. And yet it's not possible, I think, that a show of honor from my verse brings harm to you with so just a *princeps*. He himself as Father of the Country (for what title is more stately than that?) puts up with being read often in my verse. And he cannot prevent it, since Caesar is the state,[43] and in the common good I too have a share. Jupiter offers his divinity to the genius of bards and allows himself to be praised by anyone at all. Your case is safe on the example of two gods in heaven, of whom the former [Jupiter] is seen to be a god, the latter [Augustus] believed to be one.

In this passage Augustus is shown to be a matter of public attention and a corporeal representation of the Roman state. What Ovid makes explicit here has been implicit from the start of the exilic corpus: when dealing with the Caesars, what may otherwise be private becomes, *de iure*, public. This also helps to explain again why Ovid suffers an unduly severe public punishment at the hands of the *princeps* for a relatively mild offense (*error / culpa*) normally punished by a fine paid to the plaintiff in private (Ch. 2 50).

Caesar Augustus, however, is not only operative among men—both publicly and privately—but he is also at work among his fellow gods, and again he is brought here into comparison with Jupiter. The poet's ambivalence towards these two gods does not diminish the fact that their credibility depends at least partly on their treatment in verse. On the surface, it may not seem significant that Augustus simply appears in Ovid's poetry (*in nostro carmine*), while Jupiter offers his name to the talents of sacred bards (*ingeniis … uatum*); but as a self-appointed

[43] The translation of Green 1994, "for Caesar's public matter," may be more apt here. See his note, 262, and Kenney and Melville 1992, with Kenney's note, 152: "a play on the literal and extended sense of *res publica* 'public thing'." Cf. Miller 2004, 217, 232–233; Stahl 2002, 266; Wheeler and Goold 1988, ad loc.

uates himself, Ovid has clearly learned that these two gods have much in common, in particular their proclivity to become enraged. Indeed, the term *iustus* is more often attached not to Augustus himself, but to his anger, as in *Pont.* 1.8.69–70: *forsitan hic optes, ut iustam supprimat iram / Caesar* "perhaps there you should wish that Caesar quell his just wrath."[44] Given Ovid's tendency to insist upon his own guilt, it is not surprising that this *ira* is also *iusta* because the emperor's wrath is represented as justified, *Tr.* 2.29: *illa* [sc. ira] *quidem iusta est, nec me meruisse negabo* "that anger of his is indeed just, and I shall not deny that I've deserved it."

It is perhaps the prerogative of the *uates* and *exul* to straddle such a seemingly contradictory position between innocence and guilt, and in *Tristia* 4 and the ensuing books of the exile poetry Ovid refers to himself with increasing frequency as *uates*, or even *sacer uates*. This belongs, it seems, to Ovid's attempt to construct an exilic version of the sacred seer re-introduced into Roman poetry by Vergil in the *Eclogues*, appropriated by Horace to clarify and elevate his poetic project in the *Odes*, and used as a source of newfound dignity for Propertius in his final book of poems. Of course, Ovid too had often playfully exploited the figure of the *uates* in his earlier work—especially the *Fasti*[45]—but he uses the term with a palpable urgency in his exile poetry, I believe, both to call attention to his affinity with earlier Augustan poets and to counterbalance the emperor's own title of *iustus princeps*.

The first time in the corpus of the exile poetry that Ovid in fact refers to himself alone as *uates*, *Tr.* 5.3.31, he appeals to a divine being other than the *princeps* and one that in many ways stands outside the traditional (and legal) order of Roman civic life. The god in question is

---

[44] See also *Pont.* 2.8.23–24: *parce, uir inmenso maior uirtutibus orbe, / iustaque uindictae supprime lora tuae*… "O whose virtues surpass the immeasurable world, spare me and check the reins of your just vengeance …," 75–76: *uera precor fiant timidae praesagia mentis, / iustaque quamuis est sit minor ira dei* "I pray that my fearful mind's premonitions come true and that the god's anger—though just—diminish." The term also seems generally attracted to the word *ira*, although not necessarily the *princeps*', see *Pont.* 2.3.61–62 [of Cotta Maximus]: *ira quidem primo fuerat tua iusta, nec ipso / lenior, offensus qui mihi iure fuit* "Indeed at first your anger was was just and no less severe than his who was rightly incensed at me;" 4.3.21–24 [to a faithless friend]: *aut age, dic aliquam, quae te mutauerit, iram: / nam nisi iusta tua est, iusta querella mea est. / quod te nunc crimen similem uetat esse priori? / an crimen, coepi quod miser esse, uocas*? "But come, tell me of some anger that changed you: for if your complaint's not just, mine is. What crime prevents you from being what you used to be? Or do you call it crime that I've become wretched?"

[45] Cf. Bömer 1958, 11, ad *Fast.* 1.25 for parallel passages from *Am.* and *Ars.*

of course Bacchus, whom Ovid addresses here on the occasion of the *Liberalia*, an old Roman religious festival dedicated to Bacchus' Italic counterpart, Liber, and that god's feminine equivalent, Libera.[46] The festival was celebrated annually in Rome on March 17, when it was customary alongside more traditional rites for the god of wine to be honored by poets.[47] Under normal circumstances, Ovid notes, he would be present, but exile has changed the normal course of events and kept him away, as he reminds Bacchus at verse 31: *ut tamen audisti percussum fulmine uatem* "when, nevertheless, you heard that a *uates* had been struck by a thunderbolt."

The figure of the *uates* had already been introduced by the exiled Ovid to refer to Homer at *Tr.* 1.6.21 and to Sappho at *Tr.* 3.7.20. Then, in *Tr.* 3.14.7, he identifies a friend, possibly the Palatine librarian Hyginus, as *uatum studiose nouorum*.[48] In two poems from *Tristia* 4, moreover, Ovid applies the term *uates* to his predecessors at Rome, first in *Tr.* 4.4.17–18 (quoted above, 142), and again in *Tr.* 4.10, his autobiographical poem, where it refers explicitly to the likes of Vergil, Horace, Propertius, and Tibullus (42) as well as more generally to other unnamed poets (129). In all of these instances, the term *uates* applies to others, and only by indirect inference does it include the poet himself. Hence, Ovid's appearance alone as *uates* in *Tr.* 5.3 is something new and, in fact, perfectly apt for a poem written to honor the patron god of the *collegium poetarum* and so concerned with poets and poetry from the start, 1–2, 5–6:

> illa dies haec est, qua te celebrare poetae,
>   si modo non fallunt tempora, Bacche, solent…
> inter quos, memini, dum me mea fata sinebant,
>   non inuisa tibi pars ego saepe fui.

> That day is here, unless time is tricking me, on which poets are wont to celebrate you, Bacchus … among them, yes, while fate still let me, I was often a welcome part of the crowd.

---

[46] Cf. *Fast.* 3.713–790, where Ovid—again in the guise of a *uates* (714)—treats the same festival; Bömer 1958, 193–198; Scullard 1980, 91–92; *NP* s.v. "Liberalia, Liber" (F. Payon).

[47] Presumably with songs of praise, cf. Luck 1977, 288–289, on the presumptive themes. That the *Liberalia* were celebrated on the same day as the *Agonia* appears to be "a mere coincidence" (Frazer 1929, 132).

[48] *Tr.* 3.14.7–8: *immo ita fac, quaeso, uatum studiose nouoroum, / quaque potes, retine corpus in urbe meum* "now please do so, supporter of new poets: keep my body of work in the city if you can," a letter perhaps to Hyginus, librarian at the Palatine Library, cf. Evans 1983, 68 with n. 25 (186); and Luck 1977, 227, though Kaster 1995, 212, is more skeptical.

As he imagines a throng of poets attending the sacred rites of Bacchus, Ovid dreams (and he may be simulating drunkenness) that he sees the god before him, 33–34:

> et potes aspiciens circum tua sacra poetas
> 'nescioquis nostri' dicere 'cultor abest'.

> And looking around at the poets attending your sacred rites, you may say, "some worshipper of mine is missing."

These *sacra* refer, on one level, to the religious rites or sacred mysteries associated with the celebration of the *Liberalia*.[49] In Ovid's poem, however, they are cast expressly in relation to his fellow poets and can be connected with the frequent references in Ovid's exilic poems to the writing of verse as a sacred undertaking or *sacra* (*Musarum*).[50] More generally, in view of the ecstatic revelry traditionally associated with with the god of wine, the poem constructs a bibulous gathering that starts with singing (4) and ends with crying (50). In between, the poet invokes in reverent tones the lessons that can be learned from Greek myth, 27–28:

> me quoque, si fas est exemplis ire deorum,
> ferrea sors uitae difficilisque premit.

> If it is right to enter into comparison with the gods, I too am oppressed by a harsh and difficult lot in life.

What is *fas* here involves again what is right before the gods, in particular the mythic divinities of the Greek literary tradition, as Ovid likens himself to Capaneus and Bacchus' mother, Semele, both of whom were fatally struck by thunderbolts from Jupiter (29–31). In the course of this description, the reader may also be reminded of Ovid's own metaphorical "death" from the thunderbolt of Augustus (*Tr.* 1.1.81). Indeed, when the poet enlists the help of Bacchus in procuring for himself a return from Tomis (35: *fer, bone Liber, opem* "bring help, good god of release"),

[49] Luck 1977, ad loc.: μυστήρια; Wissowa 1912, 298–299, on the actual rites performed.

[50] E.g. *Tr.* 4.1.87–88: *et tamen ad numeros antiquaque sacra reuerti / sustinet in tantis hospita Musa malis* "And yet my Muse, a friend amid such great ills, is able to return to verse and her ancient rites;" 4.10.19 [justification for writing poetry]: *at mihi iam puero caelestia sacra placebant* "but even as a boy I favored heavenly pursuits;" *Pont.* 4.2.49: *sacraque Musarum merito cole* "as is right, cultivate the sacred rites of the Muses;" 4.8.76 [of Apollo]: *sed uenit ad sacras neruus uterque manus* "but the strings of both the lyre and bow come to his sacred hands;" and see below n. 68.

he mentions Lycurgus and Pentheus, who also paid with their lives for denying that god's divinity (39–40).[51] In contrast to those characters of myth, Ovid does not deny the divinity of Augustus, but sets it on par with Bacchus', 45–46:

> sunt dis inter se commercia: flectere tempta
> Caesareum numen numine, Bacche, tuo.
>
> Gods have dealings with gods: try with your own divinity, Bacchus, to make Caesar's yield.

While it may be clear that they both are gods, it is also obvious that they are not alike. On the one hand, Bacchus' divine power (wine) brings together the community of poets in Rome, while the divine anger of Augustus is directly responsible for causing Ovid's conspicuous absence from the festivities themselves. Still, the exiled *uates* manages to maintain at least a nominal presence via poetry, as the pathetic voice of a fellow poet makes known by asking, 52: *ubi est nostri pars modo Naso chori*? "where's Naso, who used to be part of our chorus?" In the end, the writing of the letter and the reading of the poem in Rome contribute far more to preserving Ovid's name—the vehicle to verifiable immortality—than his physical presence ever could, 58: *quod licet, inter uos nomen habete meum*! "it's permitted that you keep my name among you!"

If *Tr.* 5.3 turns from a potentially sodden romp to a more serious literary lesson on punishment in myth and the powerful presence of an absence that speaks—literally nine—volumes, the next poem in which the *uates* appears, *Tr.* 5.7, offers a droll reflection from start to finish on the wretched conditions of exile among barbarians in Tomis.[52] In it Ovid laments that he lacks the opportunity to use his native Latin and is even forced to speak Sarmatian, 55–56:

---

[51] In the corresponding text from the *Fasti*, the god is also asked to show favor to a *uates*, 3.714: *Bacche, faue uati, dum tua festa cano* "O Bacchus, honor me, your bard, while I sing of your festival."

[52] I have not found it necessary, as several editors (Heinsius, Luck, Hall) and one manuscript have, to separate *Tr.* 5.7 into two poems (*a* and *b*) after verse 24. The logic behind the separation states that verses 21–24, with the wish for death, "passen gut ans Ende," in the words of Luck 1977, 305, and that the direct address *amice* in 26 presumably fits a beginning well too. But Ovid elsewhere wishes for death in the middle of a poem (e.g. *Tr.* 3.3.35–36; 5.6.19–20), and also addresses the recipient of his letter again in the middle of a poem (e.g. *Pont.* 2.4.21; 4.12.20). Moreover, the poem is thematically cohesive on the topic of the harsh conditions and barbaric inhabitants on the Getic Danube from start to finish.

ille ego Romanus uates (ignoscite Musae)
  Sarmatico cogor plurima more loqui.

I'm that famous Roman bard—forgive me, Muses—compelled to speak mostly in Sarmatian!

While it is not entirely implausible that a linguistic genius such as Ovid could have learned both Sarmatian and Getic in exile (*Pont.* 3.2.40: *didici Getice Sarmaticeque loqui*), it is likely that we are dealing in this particular case with another example of Ovidian humor.[53] Indeed, the idea of speaking *Sarmatico more* appears to add dramatic effect to the telling of a joke. For the name, which may only have been known in Rome by veterans of the Augustan military campaigns around the lower Danube (*Res Gestae* 30–31) and select enthusiasts of Herodotus (4.116–117), surely would have sounded exotic and, as so often in the exile poetry, the more exotic the better.[54] The sacred status of the *uates* here is also apparently part of the joke, 17–22:

uox fera, trux uultus, uerissima mentis imago,
  non coma, non trita barba resecta manu,
dextera non segnis fixo dare uulnera cultro,
  quem uinctum lateri barbarus omnis habet.
uiuit in his Naso tenerorum oblitus amorum,
  hos uidet, hos uates audit, amice, tuus.

In voice harsh, appearance grim, the truest picture of the mind of men who trim neither hair nor beard with practiced hand. Their right hand is not slow to pierce you with the dagger that every barbarian keeps fastened to his side. Having forgotten his tender loves, friend, your bard Naso lives among these men, sees them, and hears them as well.

In the final distich Ovid refers to his first collection of poems, the *Amores*, which he now claims to have forgotten in exile because he is

---

[53] Cf. *Tr.* 3.14.46–50; and Amann 2006, 237–239. While I find it plausible that Ovid learned the native tongue(s) of the land of his exile, I still doubt his claim to have composed a poem in Getic (*pace* von Albrecht 1994, 625–626), especially after Syme's stern rebuke (1978, 17): "Scholars can be found who give credence to the 'Getic poem' … They do not offer estimates of Ovid's proficiency in spoken Getic and spoken Sarmatian … It is only a piece of fantasy, such as convention accorded to orators as well as poets—and especially to panegyrists." See Podossinov 1987, 203: "Dichterische Erfindung sind auch seine Aussagen über die sprachliche Situation in Tomis (Verderbtheit des Griechischen, Verbreitung der barbarischen Idiome, seine Kenntnis der getischen und sarmatischen Sprache usw.)."

[54] It is possible, perhaps even likely, that the name appeared on Agrippa's map of the empire, which was set up in the Porticus Vipsania between 7–2 BC; cf. Nicolet 1991, 101–102.

away from Rome—or rather *ROMA*, the city of *AMOR* and most conducive to love poetry—and surrounded by hideous and hostile Getans. The representation of the inhabitants of Tomis here is as ridiculous as it is unreal, bathetic and almost beyond inspiring pity and, again, clearly meant to be humorous.[55] When Ovid claims to talk to himself so as not to forget Latin (63–64), that too belongs to the joke, a sort of pathetic inevitability of the life of suffering he has drawn for himself in exile. Yet all this—the *uates* (22), the Geto-Greek (52), the Sarmatian (56), and, indeed, the very act of composition—is part of a larger process of escape from the actual conditions (themselves perhaps truly ineffable) surrounding him in exile, as he tells us in the final distich, 67–68:

> carminibus quaero miserarum obliuia rerum:
> praemia si studio consequar ista, sat est.
>
> Through poetry I seek oblivion from my wretched state; if this be the reward I gain from my pursuit, it is enough.

The process of escape relates, on one level, to the radically changed set of circumstances that exile has introduced into Ovid's life; on another level, it results from the profound changes that Augustus has introduced at Rome in establishing himself as the city's sole ruler and arbiter of the law throughout the empire. Ovid's attempt, as in the poem under discussion, to forget his present misery by recounting the evils of exile—in a sense, by trying to catalogue a suffering that cannot be catalogued—is an attempt to gain control over what in effect lies beyond his control. Augustus holds sway over the rule of *ius*, which entails the right to kill, save, or banish. Against this right the poet has no recourse except oblivion, which he seeks in the writing of poetry.[56] Attempting to escape the present by documenting it in verse also involves remembering the past, especially those portions of the past that pertain to his poetic fame.[57] In the above poem, for example, rewards of the past, including the applause his verses were wont to

---

[55] E.g. 45–46, 49–50: *siue homines, uix sunt homines hoc nomine digni, / quamque lupi, saeuae plus feritatis habent / . . . / pellibus et laxis arcent male frigora bracis, / oraque sunt longis horrida tecta comis* "the men—though scarcely deserving of the name 'men'—are like wolves, only more savage . . . they feebly ward off the cold with animal hides and thick pants and keep their shaggy faces covered with unkempt beards."

[56] Rosati 1979, 110–111 with n. 16, on the poet's *mens* as "strumento di consolazione e di oblio."

[57] Nagle 1980, 92–104, for memory as a theme.

receive in a full theater (*Tr.* 5.7.25–32), have been replaced by the oblivion of his wretched condition in exile, *miserarum obliuia rerum* (67). The blocking out of the present holds in store a new set of rewards (68: *praemia*) to fit the changed circumstances of his fate. These new rewards the poet wins, quite fittingly, in the same way he has always won them: through the composition of poems (68: *studio*). Though Ovid's personal fortune has been dramatically reversed by his banishment, poetry remains the sole source of solace and meaning. The act of writing, an act which defines his life as a poet and reaffirms his very existence, allows Ovid to recall the past, and it is not without a certain degree of irony that the poet *admits* in the course of a poem that he is forgetting how to speak his native Latin.[58]

Loss of his native tongue would of course be a traumatic personal experience for any poet for whom language is the most precious of possessions, and the type of complaint Ovid voices here is familiar from famous twentieth century writers in exile.[59] At the same time, the polished poetry of the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* belies Ovid's claims about language and the overall deterioration of his poetic art in exile, claims that are best understood on a symbolic level as essential to the poet's representation of his abject condition there.[60] Indeed, the sym-

[58] E.g. 57–58: *et pudet et fateor: iam desuetudine longa / uix subeunt ipsi uerba latina mihi*! "it's a shame, I admit: long neglect nearly causes me to forget Latin words myself!" and see *Tr.* 3.14.45–46: *dicere saepe aliquid conanti—turpe fateri!—/ uerba mihi desunt dedidicique loqui* "Often when I'm trying to say something—it's shameful to admit!—words fail me and I forget how to speak." Cf. Dewar 2002, 390, on a similar notion in Sen. *Dial.* 11.18.9.

[59] The Polish exile, Horst Bienek, has expressed the problem with clarity in Bienek 1990, 41: "The loss of language is probably the most decisive factor in determining exile; it is what makes exile so wretched for the writer." While in exile in California, an exile that was not altogether unpleasant, Thomas Mann nevertheless longed to live life again "*in deutscher Sprach-Sphäre*" (*Briefe 1948–1955*, ed. Erika Mann, Kempten/Allgäu: 1965, 166), and Joseph Brodsky's translations of his original English verse into Russian are clearly part of an attempt to win back or, at least, to retain the idiom of his native tongue.

[60] It is well known how scholars of the second half of the 19th cent. (e.g. Dinter 1858; Korn 1867) tried to determine by metrical analyses the truth of Ovid's claims about the deterioration of his poetic skill. This problem has been put to rest since the exhaustive study of Benedum 1967. More recently, Williams 1994, 50–99; Claassen 1989a, 362–364; and Nagle 1980, 109–120, have dissected many of Ovid's claims about the deleterious effect of exile on his verse and shown them to be rife with poetic posturing, on which Williams 2002b provides a good summary, esp. 357–360. For a different view, see Gaertner 2007a, 161–172; cf. Goold 1983, 98 with n. 8, who notes that from *Amores* through *Remedia Amoris* every pentameter (nearly 4,500 of them) ends in a word of two syllables. In the later elegiac works quadri- or pentasyllabic endings appear: 2 in *Fasti*, 3 in *Heroides* 16–21, 15 in *Tristia* (.85 %), and 31 in *Epistulae ex Ponto* (1.94 %).

bolism behind them is highly charged: Ovid's break with his language symbolizes a break with Rome, a city that no longer resembles the place of his relatively recent poetic success. The poet imagines he is forgetting the language of his earlier poetry because to remember it would be dangerous; it would run the risk of repeating (one of) the crimes that caused his exile. At the same time, it is not always entirely inconvenient to forget the language of the past: losing the ability to speak one way opens up the possibility of finding new ways of speaking, of creating new forms of language and verse that can be accommodated (or not) to the new face of the ruling power at Rome. In its commitment—on the surface, at least—to praising the Caesars as gods and showing contrite devotion to their cult, the language of the exile poetry belongs to a new phase in Roman history that began with the establishment of the principate. Even if it is deeply ironic—irony being a worthy and effective response to rejection, loss, and general helplessness—Ovid's exilic idiom marks a new mode of expression within the recently restructured Rome of Augustus and his successors. In a way that is far more overt than his poetic predecessors, Ovid inserts himself fully into the ensuing tradition of Roman imperial panegyric that places in the hands of the emperor the fulfillment of hope in nearly any venture.[61]

Yet to what extent can the unique character of Ovid's experience as a poet and political exile be applied more broadly to the fate of Roman poets generally under the principate? To start, if the writing of poetry such as the *Ars Amatoria* can be considered a criminal act, that hardly bodes well for the future of poetic expression in the empire.[62] When Augustus lays claim to a legal power against which the poet has no direct recourse, it is for the reader to decide whether Ovid's representation of such a predicament applies only to the two of them as individuals or rather to a new phase in Roman history—embodied in the person of the *princeps*—that has in effect removed the poet from the

---

[61] See Coleman 1988, 63–65, on the motifs of ruler-panegyric, and Born 1934, *passim*, e.g. 25, on the early 6th cent. (507) fulsome panegyric of the Ostrogoth king, Theoderic, by Ennodius, later Bishop of Pavia (513–521).

[62] Cf. Little 1982, 350. It is possible that Seneca had Ovid's case in mind when writing these memorable lines from *Hercules Furens*, 1237–1238: [Amph.] *quis nomen usquam sceleris errori addidit?/* [Herc.] *saepe error ingens sceleris obtinuit locum* "[Amph.] Whoever gave to a mistake the name of crime? [Herc.] Often has a great mistake earned the status of crime." Cf. Fitch 1987, 435; Billerbeck 1999, 586–587, on *nomen* ... *addidit*: "nicht nur 'einen Namen geben' ... sondern prägnant 'einen (falschen) Namen anhängen'; d.h. 'ausgeben für'." See above Ch. 2 44 n. 28.

city. The figure of the *uates* may offer a clue here: the very recent verse of Ovid's predecessors among the Augustan poets had determined the *uates* to be not only sacred but also privy to a body of knowledge not vouchsafed to the non-poet and able to transcend the limits of life on earth and endure time. Indeed, the *uates* of Augustan poetry is fundamentally focused on the future, on the posterity Ovid himself addresses in his autobiographical poem (*Tr.* 4.10.2). By becoming a sacred *uates* in exile, Ovid furnishes himself with a poetic identity for establishing an enduring counter-weight to the immediate burden of his physical punishment or, as Seamus Heaney would have it, for redressing the historical actuality that had him banished from Rome to Tomis. In the end, the figure of the *uates* allows him to lay claim to a poetic reality that depends not on what is but rather on what may be.

Vates et Exul

The last mention of the *uates* in the *Tristia* directly connects the figure of the sacred bard of Roman lore with the exiled poet of the Augustan principate. It occurs in *Tr.* 5.9, a poem of thanks to a friend (Cotta Maximus?) who seems to have saved Ovid from a deadly fate (suicide?).[63] Here, Ovid adopts the epithet *uates* to thank his loyal friend who alone stood by him when he was deserted by the rest of his companions.[64] The friend seems to have requested by letter that his name not be mentioned by Ovid in his poems from exile for fear of attracting the displeasure of the *princeps*. Hence, the poet opens the poem professing to want to praise his friend by name but tactfully avoiding doing

[63] References to suicide pervade the exile poetry, e.g. *Tr.* 3.8.39–42: *tantus amor necis est, querar ut iam Caesaris iram* [Diggle: *cum Caesaris ira* mss.], / *quod non offensas uindicet ense suas.* / *at quoniam semel est odio ciuiliter usus,* / *mutato leuior sit fuga nostra loco* "so great is my wish to die that I now complain that Caesar's anger fails to use the sword in avenging the wrongs done to him. But since he has already once exercised his hatred civily, may he make my exile more bearable by changing the place;" see also *Tr.* 1.5.6; *Pont.* 1.6.39–44; 1.9.21–22; and of his wife *Tr.* 1.3.99. This belongs to the larger theme of exile as equivalent to death, see above Intro. 12 n. 44.

[64] *Tr.* 5.9.15–19: *cumque perhorruerit casus pars maxima nostros,* / *pars etiam credi praetimuisse uelit,* / *naufragiumque meum tumulo spectarit ab alto,* / *nec dederit nanti per freta saeua manum,* / *seminecem Stygia reuocasti solus ab unda* "While most people recoiled in dread from my misfortune—though some wished to convince me that they had been worried beforehand—and watched from a perch on high my ship crash without giving a hand to me as I floundered in the savage seas: you alone called me back half-dead from the river Styx." The entire scene is reminiscent of Lucr. 2.1–19.

so in a series of contrafactuals (1: *si sineres*; 3: *te canerem*). These end in a subtle prayer for the longevity of his verse, *Tr.* 5.9.5–10:

> quid tibi deberem, tota sciretur in urbe,
> exul in amissa si tamen urbe legor.
> te praesens mitem nosset, te serior aetas,
> scripta uetustatem si modo nostra ferent,
> nec tibi cessaret doctus bene dicere lector:
> hic te seruato uate maneret honor.

> My debt to you would be known to the entire city, if, though in exile, I am read all the same in the city lost to me. The present age and one to come would know that you are merciful—if only my writings endure the test of time—and the learned reader would not cease to bless you: this honor would await you for having saved a bard.

Here Ovid joins the two terms most useful to understanding his role as both the author of the exile poetry and its subject: *exul* (6) and *uates* (10). The term *exul* relates, of course, to the present time and his current circumstances in Tomis; it underscores the poet's geographical separation from the city and his legal status in relation to the *ius Romanum*. The term *uates*, however, looks to the future, to a readership in posterity, and is to be connected to the enduring quality of his verse. In a sense, the epithet *exul* embodies the poet's existing relationship to Augustus, himself the embodiment of the Roman state and one directly responsible for Ovid's banishment, while the epithet *uates* signals a break in the immediate sequence of contemporary events and is primarily associated with the hereafter. In short, the figure of the *uates* links the poet directly to the trans-historical continuum that is the literary tradition or, as Ovid put it elsewhere, to the *carmen perpetuum*.

The epithet *uates*, moreover, refines with added vividness the distinguishing characteristic of Ovid's poetic persona in exile: he is no longer simply a love poet incommensurately punished or a legal transgressor of an unspecified kind, but now also a sacred bard of Roman lore. Ovid's dual status as conveyed by his epithets here, *exul* and *uates*, corresponds to the conceptual dichotomy outlined above between *ius* or the legal rule of Rome and *fas* or the divine right to speak before the gods. What is right before the gods is the subject of the following distich in the poem under discussion, *Tr.* 5.9.11–12:

> Caesaris est primum munus, quod ducimus auras;
> gratia post magnos est tibi habenda deos.

> The gift—that we breathe—belongs first to Caesar; after the great gods thanks must be given to you.

In his capacity as *uates* (and budding panegyrist) Ovid can acknowledge the importance of giving the gods their due, even as he shows that such acknowledgment is valuable only insofar as it can be read in poetry. Thus, the expression of gratitude to his friend does not neglect the worship of the divine Caesar, to whom the poet professes to owe his very life, but the preceding verses make clear that the good or ill repute of them all still depends on a reading public after they are dead.

The difference between the *uates* (and *fas*) and *exul* (and *ius*) identified in this poem, *Tr.* 5.9, relates to yet another distinction between the *poeta* and the *princeps* most readily exemplified by Ovid's use of the term *sacra* to refer to the writing—or literally, to the "sacred rites"—of poetry.[65] Of course, the word *sacer* was often associated with poets and poetry in Latin,[66] and Propertius had already used the term *sacra* in relation to certain religious rites to be performed by the figure of the *uates*, 4.6.1–2:

> sacra facit uates. sint ora fauentia sacris,
> et cadat ante meos icta iuuenca focos.

> The bard performs sacred rites. Let voices fall silent and be propitious to sacred rites, and let the heifer fall before my altar once it has been struck.[67]

This passage shows the potential of the *uates* to play a central role in a ritual associated with the temple of Palatine Apollo. Propertius' poem is modeled on Callimachus' second hymn to Apollo, in which the poet

---

[65] E.g. *Tr.* 4.1.27–29: *non equidem uellem, quoniam nocitura fuerunt, / Pieridum sacris inposuisse manum; / sed nunc quid faciam? uis me tenet ipsa sacrorum* "I myself could have wished not to have put my hand to the Muses' sacred rites, since they were destined to cause me harm. But now what am I to do given the power those rites still have over me?" 4.1.87–88: *et tamen ad numeros antiquaque sacra reuerti / sustinet in tantis hospita Musa malis* "And yet my Muse, a friend amid such great ills, is able to return to verse and her ancient rites." The connection of *sacra* to the art of poetry is indirect in *Ibis* 95–97: . . .*peragam rata uota sacerdos. / quisquis ades sacris, ore fauete, meis. / quisquis ades sacris, lugubria dicite uerba* "I shall perform the proper prayers as priest: whoever's present at the rites I perform, be mindful of what you say; in fact, say only mournful words." Note too that Ovid uses *sacer* to refer to the imperial household at *Pont.* 4.6.19–20.

[66] Cf. *OLD* s.v. *sacer* §8a. Ovid first uses *sacer* with *uates* at *Am.* 3.9.5, 17, 26, 29, 41, in the epicedion on the occasion of Tibullus' death. Tibullus too referred to himself as a *sacer uates* in order to sing of the war-triumphs of his patron's son, 2.5.114–115: *Praemoneo, uati parce, puella, sacro, / ut Messalinum celebrem* "Be forewarned, girl, and spare a sacred bard so that I may celebrate Messalinus in song."

[67] See Prop. 2.10.19–20, in praise of the Augustan conquests: *haec ego castra sequar; uates tua castra canendo / magnus ero: seruent hunc mihi fata diem* "I shall follow this line and in singing its praises shall be a great bard: let fate preserve this day for me." Cf. Verg. *G.* 2.173–176, 193–196; 4.520–522.

appears as a priest at the outset with the youth of Cyrene to await the arrival of the god. Both Callimachus' poem and Propertius' reworking of it demonstrate how to represent a sacred religious rite in verse. The appearance of a priest, for example, and the language of worship create a sphere of sacredness, perhaps only vaguely associated with any actual religious practice, yet certainly conscious of being itself "sacred."

That Ovid too was keen to invest his poetry of exile with an element of sacredness is at least partly explained by the arguments of the last chapter on the poet's ritual devotion to the Caesars as newfound divinities of the state. Given the importance of the figure of the *uates* to Ovid's poetic identity in exile, it is not surprising that the word *sacer* is found most often in tandem with that term.[68] There is in this regard a loaded verbal combination, *communia sacra*, that first appears in *Pont.* 2.10, a poem addressed to Macer, the *uates* of *Amores* 2.18 and Ovid's traveling companion in Greece in their youth, *Pont.* 2.10.17–18:

> sunt tamen inter se communia sacra poetis,
> diuersum quamuis quisque sequamur iter.
>
> There are, nevertheless, sacred rites common to poets, though each one of us follows a different course.[69]

The same combination appears again in another poem we have already seen, *Pont.* 3.4, the triumph-poem addressed to Rufinus, with an apostrophe—not surprisingly—to fellow *uates* (65) also composing commemorative pieces on the triumph, 67: *sunt mihi uobiscum communia sacra, poetae* "I have sacred rites in common with you, poets." Poets are once more

[68] The *uates* figures directly in the following instances, *Tr.* 3.7.32 [Perilla]: *inque bonas artes et tua sacra redi* "return to the noble arts and your sacred rites;" 4.10.19 [autobiography]: *at mihi iam puero caelestia sacra placebant* "but even as a boy I favored heavenly pursuits;" 5.3.15 [Bacchus poem]: *tu tamen e sacris hederae cultoribus unum / numine debueras sustinuisse tuo* "Yet your divine power should have supported one who devoutly cultivates your ivy;" 5.3.33: *aspiciens circum tua sacra poetas* "looking at the poets engaged in your ritual;" *Pont.* 2.5.71–72 [Salanus, Germanicus' teacher]: *iure igitur studio confinia carmina uestro / et commilitii sacra tuenda putas* "rightly then do you believe that my poetry is linked to what you do and that the sacred rites of our common pursuits ought to be protected;" 4.2.25: *impetus ille sacer, qui uatum pectora nutrit, / qui prius in nobis esse solebat, abest* "that blessed vigor, which feeds poets' hearts and which I used to have, is now gone;" 4.2.49: *sacraque Musarum merito cole* "as is right, cultivate the sacred rites of the Muses." *Pont.* 4.8.76 [Germanicus]: *sed uenit ad sacras neruus uterque manus* "but the strings of both the lyre and bow come to Apollo's sacred hands;" 4.8.81: *communia sacra poetis*: "sacred rites common to poets."

[69] Evans 1983, 142, reads *communia sacra* here as part of an "appeal to literary ties within the collection."

in play in *Pont.* 4.13, a poem to certain Carus, whom Ovid calls *sodalis*, which amounts to a technical term for poet in his exile poetry.[70] This Carus receives a letter about the *laudes Caesaris* that Ovid claims to have written in Getic after hearing that the disembodied spirit of the emperor had ascended to heaven's abode.[71] As earlier in the exilic corpus, so too in this poem from the final book of the *Epistulae ex Ponto* do the common bonds of sacred study unite the poets, 43: *per studii communia foedera sacri*. At the very least, Ovid's consistent use of the term *sacer* with poetry shows the exiled poet attempting to bestow upon his professional pursuit a degree of sacredness and perhaps even to elevate his art into something "worthy to be regarded as divine" (*OLD* s.v. *sacer* §9). In combination with the figure of the *uates*, the references to poetry as a sacred undertaking provides the banished poet with a viable answer, if not a definitive counterbalance, to the divine status of Augustus and the imperial family in these poems.

Germanicus: uates et princeps

The most prominent member of the imperial family after Augustus in the exile poetry—the *Epistulae ex Ponto* in particular—is Caesar Germanicus, in whom Ovid unites the political world of the *princeps* with the poetic world of the *uates*.[72] His prominence in imperial politics and

---

[70] Helzle 1989, 22, has shown that *sodalis*, used six times in *Tr.* and five in *Pont.*, almost always means "poet" in the exile poetry, e.g. of Propertius at *Tr.* 4.10.45–46; cf. Habinek 1998, 164.

[71] *Pont.* 4.13.25–26: *nam patris Augusti docui mortale fuisse / corpus, in aetherias numen abisse domos* "for I wrote of how the body of Father Augustus was mortal, but that his spirit had gone back to its heavenly home." This passage may in fact refer to the eagle that was (said to have been) let loose from the imperial pyre at Augustus' funeral (Dio 56.42.3), on which Gradel 2002, 291–295.

[72] Of Germanicus' poetry we have two epigrams (*Anthologia Latina* 708–709 Riese) as well as a translation of Aratus' *Phaenomena*. Cf. Kroll *RE* X.458–464; the edition (text, translation, and commentary) of Gain 1976; and most recently Possanza 2004, who offers a summary of the dispute over the dedicatee of Germanicus' poem (227–235). Tiberius and the deified Augustus are the likely candidates, and the question hinges on the opening, 1–2: *Ab Ioue principium magno deduxit Aratus / carminis; at nobis, genitor, tu maximus auctor* "Aratus began his poem with great Jupiter; but you, father, are the greatest source of poetry for me," and subsequent apostrophe to the deified Augustus, 558–560: *hic, Auguste, tuum genitali corpore numen / attonitas inter gentis patriamque pauentem / in caelum tulit et maternis reddidit astris* "Amid thunder-struck nations and a homeland in fear, Augustus, he raised your divinity from its mortal body into heaven and returned it to the maternal stars." The obsequious language is reminiscent of Ovidian panegyric,

his well-known devotion to poetry made him an ideal candidate for Ovid's letters of appeal from Tomis. He was of course the second dedicatee of the *Fasti* when Ovid revised that poem in exile after the death of Augustus.[73] As the presumptive successor to Tiberius and among the most powerful men in the empire, Germanicus has the potential to provide Ovid with the help needed to obtain a reprieve of his sentence and a return from exile.[74] At the same time, as a fellow poet he may also be a kindred soul, a *uates* himself whose link to the exiled *uates* depends on the exercise of *ingenium*. Yet Germanicus seems to embody two ideas that elsewhere in these poems are clearly at odds with one another: acquired poetic artistry and inherited political power. To be sure, his relationship with Ovid is from the outset very different from the one the poet has with Augustus, and by any measure, Germanicus is presented in a very positive light as one of the few genuine sources of hope in the exile poetry. In terms of the arguments advanced here, he represents a potential link between the sacred speech of poets (*fas*) and the rule of law at Rome (*ius*). As both *uates* and future *princeps*, moreover, he allows for the possibility—albeit unrealized—that the apparent rift that has developed between Ovid as poet and Augustus as emperor can be mended.

The figure of Germanicus appears together with the term *uates* for the first time in *Pont.* 2.1, a poem addressed to the young *princeps*-in-waiting on the occasion of his uncle Tiberius' Pannonian triumph.[75] After an apostrophe to Germanicus at verse 49, in which Ovid mentions that news of his success in the Pannonian campaign has reached

---

which may be directed at figures alive and dead, e.g. *Pont.* 4.9.127–128 to the deified Augustus who is, in my view, also the dedicatee of Germanicus' poem. Cf. Fantham 1985, 255–256.

[73] Herbert-Brown 1994, 173–185, 204–212; Fantham 1985, 256–266; Syme 1978, 21, 87–90, 156–157; cf. Evans 1983, 138–141, 159–160; Galasso 1995, 17–19; and Berrino and Luisi 2002, 30–35, on Ovid's political ties to Germanicus.

[74] Cassius Dio (56.26.1) attests to Germanicus' influence over the regular jurors in the *iudicia publica* (public trials), at which a quaestor accused of murder persuades Germanicus to intervene on his behalf, prompting his accuser to attempt to get the case taken up by Augustus who, predictably, demurs. It deserves to be noted that it is at least possible that Ovid had no real hope of returning to Rome and that, despite appearances to the contrary, these poems are not meant to obtain his reprieve; so Claassen 1987, 39–40; and cf. Heckel 2003, 93: "Man kann die Frage stellen, ob der verbannte Schriftsteller jemals ernsthaft damit gerechnet hat, dass Augustus die Strafe mildern oder aussetzen würde."

[75] Oct. 23, 12 AD; see Syme 1978, 40.

the shores of Pontus,[76] the poet calls attention to his own ability as *uates* to predict the future, *Pont.* 2.1.55–56:

> quod precor, eueniet: sunt quiddam oracula uatum:
> nam deus optanti prospera signa dedit.

> What I pray for will happen: the prophecies of bards are worth something; for a god has given favorable signs to me when I ask.

What the poet predicts, perhaps already an inevitability in the eyes of all at Rome, is that Germanicus too will one day receive his own triumph.[77] The passage does not acknowledge that the young general could write of his own military victories, although this is what we might have expected from Ovid the panegyrist. For it is exactly what Quintilian in an obsequious show of flattery implies once about the tyrant Domitian, a self-styled *poeta*, *Inst. Orat.* 10.1.91: *Quis enim caneret bella melius quam qui sic gerit?* "For who could sing of war better than he who wages it?"[78] Instead, Ovid prophesies (62: *uaticinor*) that he himself will celebrate Germanicus' triumph in song, if perchance he survives

---

[76] *Pont.* 2.1.49: *pertulit hic idem nobis, Germanice, rumor / oppida sub titulo nominis isse tui* "The same rumor informed me, Germanicus, that towns went under your name in the triumph."

[77] *Pont.* 2.1.57–58: *te quoque uictorem Tarpeias scandere in arces / laeta coronatis Roma uidebit equis* "Rome will rejoice to see you too scale the Tarpeian rock as a victor on a garlanded chariot." Of course, Germanicus' (German) triumph does eventually happen on May 26, 17 AD, which Ovid mentions in *Fast.* 1.285–286, the latest datable reference in the Ovidian corpus.

[78] The whole passage is instructive for the way in which it juxtaposes the art of the *princeps* to the art of the *poeta*, Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.91: *Hos* [sc. Valerium Flaccum, Saleium Bassum, Lucanum et al.] *nominamus quia Germanicum Augustum ab institutis studiis deflexit cura terrarum, parumque dis uisum est esse eum maximum poetarum. Quid tamen his ipsis eius operibus in quae donato imperio iuuenis secesserat sublimius, doctius, omnibus denique numeris praestantius? Quis enim caneret bella melius quam qui sic gerit? Quem praesidentes studiis deae propius audirent? Cui magis suas artis aperiret famliare numen Minerua? Dicent haec plenius futura saecula, nunc enim ceterarum fulgore uirtutum laus ista praestringitur. Nos tamen sacra litterarum colentis feres, Caesar, si non tacitum hoc praeterimus et Vergiliano certe uersu testamur: 'inter uictrices hederam tibi serpere laurus'* "I mention these poets because Germanicus Augustus (Domitian) has been distracted from pursuing poetry by the attention he pays to governing the world and the gods have decided that it is beneath him to be the greatest of poets. Yet what is more sublime, learned and ultimately outstanding in every respect than those works to which he had retreated as a youth although he had been offered power? Who could sing of war better than he who wages it? To whom would the Muses listen more closely? To whom would Minerva—his family's protectress—reveal more of her art? Future ages will tell of this more fully: for now that praise is dimmed by the glow of his other virtues. Nevertheless, Caesar, you will allow that I who cultivate the sacred rites of literature not pass over this in silence and even bear witness with a verse from Vergil: 'ivy snakes among the laurel leaves of your victory crown'."

the sword of the savage Getans in exile.[79] The poetic accomplishments of Germanicus as *uates* are thus passed over in favor of his success as a general, that is, as future *princeps* and a member of the Caesarian household.

The house of the Caesars is of course of primary importance to the exiled poet. For him it holds a unique status that effectively elides the distinction between public and private, as Ovid mentions earlier in the poem under discussion, *Pont.* 2.1.17–18:

> gaudia Caesareae gentis pro parte uirili
> sunt mea: priuati nil habet illa domus.

> The joys of Caesar's family are mine too, as long as I can make them so: that house keeps nothing private.

This passage exemplifies the way in which Ovid is at pains in the exile poetry to show how the private house of the emperor has in fact become part of the public domain in the newly reshaped cultural landscape of the city. Of course, the poet's only access to the Caesars' public joy is through rumor (19: *fama*; 49: *rumor*), itself carried through the letters he receives and sends. Ovid emphasizes the distance between himself and the source of his information in order to call attention to his physical absence from Rome even as he recreates his presence there via verse.

Thomas Habinek has analyzed this problem from the reverse perspective and advanced the theory that Ovid's ability to recreate the city of Rome in Tomis belongs to a process of imperial pacification of the barbarian there.[80] Habinek argues that "by continuing to produce poetry, despite his relegation, he demonstrates and enacts the transferability of Roman institutions to an alien context" (164). On a literal level at least, this theory is unassailable: Ovid continues to produce Roman poetry in Tomis because he could not do otherwise; the alternative was silence. Of course, Habinek himself recognizes the metaphorical richness of these poems—*viz.* his insights into literary

[79] *Pont.* 2.1.63–68: *Hunc quoque carminibus referam fortasse triumphum, / sufficiet nostris si modo uita malis, / inbuero Scythicas si non prius ipse sagittas / abstuleritque ferox hoc caput ense Getes. / Quae si me saluo dabitur tua laurea templis, / omina bis dices uera fuisse mea.* "Perhaps I shall sing of this triumph too, if only I survive these hardships and don't color Scythian arrows with my blood and lose my head to the sword of a fierce Getan. If the laurel is dedicated to you in the temple while I'm alive, you will say that my predictions have come true twice."

[80] Habinek 1998, 151–169; ib. 2002, 55–61; and cf. Davis 2002 for a critique of Habinek's post-colonial reading of the exile poetry.

corruption and bodily contagion (162)—and yet his readings tend to emphasize the physical distance and corporeality of Ovid's historical exile over the imaginary space and disembodied voice of the poems themselves. There, for example, Ovid's problem of contagion and corruption is also the emperor's: via verse the poet brings Tomis to Rome and leads the barbarians, as it were, inside the gates to remind the Romans of his own banishment from the city. When Ovid claims, moreover, that he is becoming an almost "Getic poet" (*Pont.* 4.13.18; cf. *Tr.* 3.14.46–50), his claim is clearly part of a metaphor for his physical marginalization to the edge of the empire and may be as much boast—or even threat—as lament. Perhaps above all, Ovid's representation of himself there enacts his transformation into something else, a kind of character-metamorphosis in exile from love-poet, aetiologist, and mythographer to foreign exile and sacred bard of woe. As such, he is truly alien, an other-poet previously unknown to the Roman consciousness and, in this regard, a fitting pendant to the new historical reality of imperial rule.[81] For he is, as he says repeatedly, effectively dead to Rome, and his metaphorical death on the margins of empire serves as an uncomfortable reminder at home of the *princeps*' unwarranted and decidedly autocratic treatment of the city's most celebrated poet.[82] Crucial for his ability to return to Rome is the figure of the *uates*: becoming a *uates* in exile allows him "see" what he cannot in actuality have seen. In the present poem, *Pont.* 2.1, the *uates* furnishes Ovid with an imaginative power clearly distinguishable from the military might that Germanicus exercises as general and future *princeps* here.

The power of the exiled *uates* to recreate in his mind what others may see with their eyes plays out of course elsewhere in the later exilic poems. In the above-mentioned letter to Rufinus, for example, about another triumph of Tiberius—this time in 13 AD over Germany where Germanicus may in fact have had the central role[83]—Ovid writes that other *uates* wrote of what they saw, *Pont.* 3.4.17: *spectatum uates alii scripsere triumphum*, while he had to gather what he could from hearsay. He was, he says, forced to use rumor for his eyes, 19–20:

[81] Davis 2002, 264.

[82] On Ovid's metaphorical death see above 151 n. 63.

[83] For Syme 1978, 53, the poem is of "sudden importance" for the "Forgotten Campaigns" of his Chapter IV, in which he reaches the conclusion, 63: "[*Pont.* 3.4] hails victory and the near prospect of a triumph from Germany, Tiberius Caesar being assigned the credit. Why not, even if the alleged victory in the field was won by Germanicus?"

nos ea uix auidam uulgo captata per aurem
  scripsimus, atque oculi fama fuere mei.

I wrote what I could catch from the people with an avid ear, and rumor took the place of my eyes.[84]

The power of the poet's mind is on display: as *uates* he is able to see things by means of his own special poetic capacity. This also appears to be the significance of Ovid's use of the term in an earlier passage from the *Ibis*, 243–247:

et, ne longa suo praesagia diceret ore [Clotho],
  'fata canet uates qui tua,' dixit 'erit.'
ille ego sum uates: ex me tua uulnera disces,
  dent modo di uires in mea uerba suas;
carminibusque meis accedent pondera rerum.

And so as not to give the predictions of the future from her own mouth, Clotho said, "there will be a bard to sing your fates." I'm that bard: from me you will learn of your wounds, as long as the gods put vigor into my words. For the fulfillment of the matter will be added to what I've said in verse.

Ovid assumes the epithet *uates* in order to give voice to the predictions of (one of) the Fates and to demonstrate his own power over his enemy, whom he calls "Ibis" in allusion to Callimachus' poem of reproach by the same title.[85] Here, however, the poet is not merely using his power as *uates* to recreate in his mind what has already happened, but rather to see into the future. The knowledge of future events is a source of power for Ovid over his enemy, just as it will become an empowering source of poetic creativity in the face of the *princeps*' direct control of events in Rome, in particular the legal circumstances of the poet's exile.

---

[84] On the *uates* in the same poem, see 83–86: *res quoque tanta fuit, quantae subsistere summo / †Aeneidos† uati grande fuisset onus. / ferre etiam molles elegi tam uasta triumphi / pondera disparibus non potuere rotis* "The theme too was great enough to have been a great burden to bear for even Vergil, the best bard of them all;" 89–90: *irrita uotorum non praesagia uatum: / danda Ioui laurus, dum prior illa uiret* "Bards' predictions do not fail to fulfill wishes: a laurel-wreath is destined to be given to Jupiter while that earlier one (*sc.* just given) is still green."

[85] The *Ibis* is likely to have been written between 10–12 AD, though the identity of Ovid's enemy remains a mystery, perhaps justly so, as Housman has memorably argued, 1972, 3.1040: "Who was Ibis? Nobody. He is much too good to be true. If one's enemies are of flesh and blood, they do not carry complaisance so far as to choose the dies Alliensis for their birthday and the most ineligible spot in Africa for their birthplace. Such order and harmony exist only in worlds of our own creation, not in the jerry-built edifice of the demiurge."

Ovid's connection to the *princeps*-in-waiting, Germanicus, is of course also tied to future events. In *Pont.* 2.5, for example, Ovid himself assumes the epithet *uates* in a letter addressed to Salanus, Germanicus' teacher of rhetoric, whose excellence resides in his ability to elicit words of divine cadence from his exceptional charge.[86] Because of his special access to the future *princeps*, Salanus can be a useful ally in winning a return from Tomis for Ovid, the now exiled *uates*, 57–58:

> huic tu cum placeas et uertice sidera tangas,
> scripta tamen profugi uatis habenda putas.
>
> Although he likes you and you now touch the stars with your head, you still think the writings of an exiled bard worthy of consideration.

In fact, the notion of a reprieve yields to the stress the poet places on the kindred nature of their endeavors in poetry and rhetoric. Ovid and Salanus are joined in mind (59: *ingeniis … iunctis*) because of the common bonds of their intellectual pursuits (60: *studii foedera*). Both of these, in turn, allow them to share certain sacred rites, 71–72:

> iure igitur studio confinia carmina uestro
> ut commilitii sacra tuenda putas.
>
> Rightly, then, do you believe that songs akin to your pursuit be looked after like the sacred rites of a kindred service.

The main emphasis in the poem is on *ingenium* (21, 26, 44, 59), a natural prerequisite for the enjoyment of such sacred rites (*sacra*), themselves

---

[86] *Pont.* 2.5.41–56: *te iuuenum princeps, cui dat Germania nomen, / participem studii Caesar habere solet. / tu comes antiquos, tu primis iunctus ab annis / ingenio mores aequiperante places. / Te dicente prius studii fuit impetus illi / teque habet elicias qui sua uerba tuis. / Cum tu desisti mortaliaque ora quierunt / tectaque non longa conticuere mora, / surgit Iuleo iuuenis cognomine dignus, / qualis ab Eois Lucifer ortus aquis, / dumque silens adstat, status est uultusque diserti / spemque decens doctae uocis amictus habet. / Mox, ubi pulsa mora est atque os caeleste solutum, / hoc superos iures more solere loqui / atque 'Haec est' dicas 'facundia principe digna': / eloquio tantum nobilitatis inest* "The leader of the youth, Germanicus Caesar, tends to keep you at his side when he studies. You are an old companion, joined to him from earliest youth, whom he likes because your nature matches your character. What you say spurs him on to speak afterwards, and your words bring forth words from him. When you've finished and mortal lips have grown quiet, closed in silence for a short time, a young man worthy of the Iulean name arises like the morning star from eastern waters. While he stands in silence, his posture and look are those of an eloquent speaker, and his handsome robe holds out hope in a speech full of learning. Then when he's put aside delay and opened his heavenly mouth, you would swear that the gods above are wont to speak this way and say, 'this is eloquence worthy of a prince', because of how much nobility is in what he says."

again tightly linked to the sacred status of the poetic endeavor. Of course, this was also the case in another of the Germanicus poems, *Pont.* 4.8, whose delightfully loaded hexameter, *di quoque carminibus, si fas est dicere, fiunt* (63), calls to mind the prologue to the *Fasti*, also addressed to Germanicus and rewritten from exile after the death of Augustus.[87] There, Ovid asks the future emperor and fellow poet, *si licet et fas est, uates rege uatis habenas* "If it is allowed and right, *uates*, guide the course of another *uates*."[88] In addition to the clear echoes heard in deferential conditionals—*si licet et fas est / si fas est dicere*[89]—the notion of what is *fas*, or right by divine law, is linked to Germanicus' status as *uates*.

And yet the *sacra*, or sacred rites, are different in correlation to the different set of circumstances behind the composition of the poems. In the *Fasti*, for example, the word *sacra* implies the rules and rituals marked on the state calendar, or what we might note properly belongs to Varro's understanding of a civil theology (see Ch. 4 109–110); as such, it is inextricably bound to the city of Rome.[90] In the exile poetry, however, the term *sacra* refers to the art of poetry itself and makes up a critical part of Ovid's self-representation as a *uates* in exile. By denoting poetic composition on the margins of the empire as something sacred, the poet appears to respond to the *princeps*' own highly visible and widely influential presence in the practice of religion (*sacra*) and law (*ius*) at Rome. Viewed from this perspective, Ovid's redefining of

---

[87] Though *ex Ponto* Book 4 is generally agreed to have been a posthumous publication, it is nevertheless tempting to envision a sequence regarding individual poems: after *Pont.* 4.8 has been sent to Suillius and made it into Germanicus' hands, the *Fasti*-dedication makes good on Ovid's promise to sing the prince's praises, *Pont.* 4.8.87: *tuas possim laudes celebrare recentes* "I could celebrate recent praises." See Fantham 1985, 269–272, on the very close correspondence between *Pont.* 4.8 and the *Fasti*.

[88] Note the earlier prayer for Germanicus to control the reins of the world in Ovid's letter to his teacher Salanus, *Pont.* 2.5.75–76: [Germanicus] *succedatque suis orbis moderator habenis, / quod mecum populi uota precantur idem* "and that he take over the running of the world with his own reins is what I and the people alike wish and pray for."

[89] The formula is repeated in *Pont.* 4.16.45: *dicere si fas est*, the last poem of the collection, again about *uates* and making poems, and *Tr.* 5.2.46: *si fas est homini cum Ioue posse loqui* "if it is right for a man to speak with Jupiter," in an open prayer of supplication from poet to *princeps*. Cf. also *Tr.* 3.1.77–82; 3.5.27–28: *seu temere expecto, siue id contigere fas est, / tu mihi, quod cupio, fas, precor, esse proba* "whether I am rash in my hope or whether it is right that it happen, prove to me that what I want is right."

[90] For example, from the first book alone, *Fast.* 1.7: *sacra recognosces annalibus eruta priscis* "you will recognize sacred rites dug out of the annals of old," 14, 333, 348, 618, 627, 660: '*quid a fastis non stata sacra petis*?' " 'why do you look for rites not fixed in the calendar?' "

sacra as the poetic act in exile marks an attempt on his part to defend the art of poetry itself and, more specifically, to reclaim for Roman poets a stake in determining what constitutes divinity (*di*) and, for that matter, what it is right to say (*fas*). When taken together with the poet's repeated emphasis on space here, this kind of reflection on the poetic craft also entails creating a metaphorical place of intellectual refuge that is distinct from the actual world of physical experience. What he represents in verse—whether Tomis or Rome—becomes for Ovid an imagined reality constructed to offset the very real and painful burden of geographical isolation; exile enables him to create, in short, the kind of place where poetry achieves a redressive capacity over against the forces of history. Clearly, the historical circumstances of poetic composition for the *Fasti* and exile poetry—as well as the very meaning of the word *sacra*—have changed; and yet in both places the poet as *uates* still plays a central role.

In the *Fasti* the sacred status of the *uates* conveniently affords Ovid the right *not* to sing of Caesar's military exploits, a *recusatio* of sorts on religious grounds.[91] In the exile poetry, by contrast, the *uates* has been physically excluded from the religious center of the city, where before among the Augustan poets he had been viewed as useful to the community for his ability to communicate with the divine.[92] Ovid must have been fully aware of this connection when he wrote at the beginning of the final book of the *Fasti*, 6.7–8:

> fas mihi praecipue uoltus uidisse deorum,
> uel quia sum uates, uel quia sacra cano.

> It is right for me especially to have seen the faces of gods both because I'm a bard and because I sing of sacred rights.

---

[91] E.g. *Fast.* 1.13–14: *Caesaris arma canant alii: nos Caesaris aras / et quoscumque sacris addidit ille dies*. "Let others sing of Caesar's arms: I shall sing of Caesar's altars and those days he added to the holy festivals."

[92] See Hor. *Ep.* 2.1.119–138: *uatis auarus / non temere est animus; uersus amat, hoc studet unum / … / militiae quamquam piger et malus, utilis urbi / … / castis cum pueris ignara puella mariti / disceret unde preces, uatem ni Musa dedisset?/ … / carmine di superi placantur, carmine Manes* "the bard's mind is not rashly greedy; he loves verse, his one and only passion … though a feckless and incompetent soldier, he is beneficial to the city … from where would an unwed girl together with chaste boys learn the prayerful chants, if the Muse had not given them a bard? … Poetry placates both the gods above and those below;" and Brink 1982, 157, ad loc.: "In sum the religious aspect [of the term *uates*] enables H. to let this account culminate in a picture of the poet as the spokesman of the community in its dealings with the gods."

His project as *uates* in exile has changed from composing learned aetiologies on religious rites—though one finds one's fair share of *aitia* in the exile poetry[93]—to re-composing myths in accordance with the Greek and Latin literary tradition *and* the new religious order at Rome. In this regard the figure of the *uates* acts as a kind of bridge between literature and religion for the exiled poet and, in a sense, between his poetically reconstructed world of Tomis and the historically reshaped city of Rome. Of course, the *princeps-uates*, Germanicus himself, never manages to bring Ovid back or mend the rift between poet and prince, and this particular *exul-uates* can only ever exist in the permanent exile of the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto*. Yet there, as a fully disembodied and now purely poetic presence, Ovid himself continues to take an essential part in the religious discourse at Rome, especially in helping to construct and define the newly deified status of Augustus and his family. It is hard to miss the irony here: the first *uates* of Rome's new gods is also the first victim of their divine retribution.

Summary

As a permanently exiled *uates*, Ovid carries the scars of his vindictive divinity's thunderbolt to the place of his banishment, and his disembodied voice, intoning unfailing laments in a long series of elegies from the shores of the Black Sea, offers a powerful metaphor for his physical helplessness before the emperor Augustus. The *uates* becomes so vital to the poet in exile precisely because that figure's sacred status within the community and special knowledge of future events provide Ovid with a sphere of influence that does not depend on his relation to the *princeps*. Augustus may legally ban him from the city, even as the poet professes to be more concerned with his place in the literary tradition to come. Of course, nearly all Greek and Latin poets were obsessed with their place in the canon, and the desire for literary fame and

[93] E.g. the humorous explantion of the name of Tomis, *Tr.* 3.9.33–34: *inde Tomis dictus locus hic, quia fertur in illo / membra soror fratris consecuisse sui* "From there this place is called Tomis because they say that in it a sister cut up the limbs of her own brother." The name of Ovid's place of exile is connected etymologically to the Greek τέμνω "to cut" and thus to Medea's gruesome fratricide. An outlandish aetiology allows the poet to show off his knowledge of local lore, the Greek language, and the literary tradition, even as he injects some morbid levity into his poems.

immortality vouchsafed by a readership in posterity had long become conventional. Nevertheless, the existence of such a convention is instructive for comprehending how poets present themselves in relation to contemporary events: their actual concern, almost by default, is with the hereafter.

The sacred status of the *uates* was something that Ovid had inherited from Vergil, Propertius, and Tibullus and that he had already exploited in his poetry prior to exile. While in Tomis, however, he may have connected the term *sacer* in particular to the role of the *uates* on the basis of Horace *Odes* 4.9.25–28:

> uixere fortes ante Agamemnona
> multi; sed omnes illacrimabiles
> urgentur ignotique longa
> nocte, carent quia uate sacro.

> There lived many brave men before Agamemnon; but all are weighed down by lasting death, unmourned for and unknown because they lack a sacred bard.

Ovid answers Horace's poem on Homer, as it were, with mournful appeals from exile that are anything but *illacrimabiles*. He himself is conscious of becoming the *sacer uates* that the unknown souls lack in the underworld; indeed, as such he may keep himself "known" to posterity. According to Horace's account (and the picture of Achilles singing the κλέα ἀνδρῶν in *Iliad* 9.189), heroes need an epic poet to accord them the mourning that is their due and to win them the fame that they desire. By Ovid's own account there is no chance of further fame in Tomis, only extended suffering and death. Given his professed state of sadness in exile, the poet exploits the widely-held view in classical antiquity that associated the elegiac distich with lament. For the *poeta doctus* elegy provides the opportunity to test the generic validity of meter by allowing form and content to convene, as he says in *Tristia* 5.1.5–7:

> flebilis ut noster status est, ita flebile carmen,
> materiae scripto conueniente suae.
> integer et laetus laeta et iuuenalia lusi.

> As my condition is lamentable, so is my song a lament; the writing is suited to its subject matter. When as a young man I was happy and successful, I played the happy tunes of youth.

These "happy tunes of youth" were of course also sung in the self-same meter of elegy, where form was consequently *not*—on the surface at least—suited to its subject matter.

In exile, however, towards the end of his life, Ovid appears intent on achieving a certain purity in poetry where matter and meter are matched and form *in se* aids meaning. At the same time, he is clearly playing with the meter of elegy as the form of the funerary epigram, a fact which serves to turn these poems into the extended epitaph from exile of a once famous but now, metaphorically speaking, dead poet.[94] In contrast to the unsung (or unwept-for) heroes in Horace that died forgotten without a Homer to sing their praises, Ovid sings his own funerary lament and weeps for his own soul in the underworld.[95] In this regard, he becomes a new Homer, his own Homer, a status he is conscious of in his capacity as the *author* of his own woe.[96] Yet as the *subject* of that lament he also maintains a poetic persona with a quasi-mythical status like Horace's Agamemnon. By becoming himself a character like to the mythical figures celebrated by Homer and Horace he opens up the possibility of ensuring his own immortality through literature and challenging the permanence of death with the prospect

---

[94] See Herescu 1958, esp. 440, and above 12–13 with nn. 44–45, on Ovid's self-composed epitaph, *Tr.* 3.3.73–76; cf. Kenney and Melville 1992, ad *Tr.* 4.10, esp. Kenney's note, 156–157: "Having suffered symbolical death in exile, Ovid now writes his own extended epitaph. An analogy with Augustus' *Res Gestae* might also suggest itself." It is also noteworthy that an undatable funerary inscription from Rome, *CIL* VI.2 9632.3–2, quotes *Tr.* 1.11.11–12: *seu stupor huic studio siue est insania nomen, / omnis ab hac cura cura leuata mea est* "whether you call my writing state a 'trance' or 'madness', care for it alone has lightened all my cares."

[95] As in the poem under discussion, *Tr.* 5.1.13–14: *sic ego, Sarmaticas longe proiectus in oras, / efficio tacitum ne mihi funus eat* "so do I, cast forth onto distant Sarmatian shores, make sure my death does not go unheard;" 47–48: *interea nostri quid agant, nisi triste, libelli? / tibia funeribus conuenit ista meis* "Meanwhile what else but sadness should my books convey? That kind of pipe is apt for my funeral." And cf. *Tr.* 1.3.21–22, 89; 1.8.14; *Pont.* 1.9.17–18: *illum non aliter flentem mea funera uidi, / ponendus quam si frater in igne foret* "I saw him crying at my funeral as if his brother had been placed on the pyre;" 2.3.3–4: *culte mihi—quid enim status hic a funere differt?—/ supremum uitae tempus adusque meae* "honored by me up until the end of my life—for how does this condition differ from death?"

[96] Later, in the middle of the 1st cent. AD, Lucan would make explicit the connection of the *sacer uatum labor* to the immortality ensured by the poetry of Homer, 9.980–986: *O sacer et magnus uatum labor, omnia fato / eripis et populis donas mortalibus aeuum. / Invidia sacrae, Caesar, ne tangere famae; / nam, si quid Latiis fas est promittere Musis, / quantum Zmyrnaei durabunt uatis honores, / uenturi me teque legent; Pharsalia nostra / uiuet et a nullo tenebris damnabimur aeuo* "O sacred and great task of bards, you snatch everything from death and grant eternal life to mortal men. May you not be touched, Caesar, by envy for sacred fame: for if it is right for Italian Muses to promise anything, as long as the honors of the Smyrnaen bard last, those to come will read me and you: our *Pharsalia* will live, and no age will condemn us to darkness."

of the permanence of his elegiac laments from exile. This implies, of course, the creation of a poetic *monumentum* of a character different from Horace's and, as I shall show in the next chapter, from Homer's as well.

CHAPTER SIX

OVIDIUS NASO, POETA ET EXUL: OVID'S IDENTIFICATION WITH HOMER AND ULYSSES IN *TR.* AND *PONT.*

Ilias est fati longa futura mei

"There will be a long *Iliad* of my misfortune."

Pont. 2.7.34

The arguments I have presented thus far regarding the representation of Roman religion and law in the exile poetry center around a series of interpretive dualities—mortal / divine, private / public, *princeps / poeta, ius / fas*, *exul / uates*—that can also be brought to bear on Ovid's status as poet and exile, that is, as author and subject of these poems. To start, the poet's consistent use of the name "Naso" to define his exilic persona throughout the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* invites his readers to distinguish accordingly between Ovid, the famous author, and *Naso*, the suffering exile.[1] This distinction plays out repeatedly in Ovid's comparisons of himself to Homer, the paradigmatic poet in antiquity, and to Ulysses, the paradigmatic exile in myth.[2] Of course, the poet's literary allusions in exile recall several authorial models other than Homer, and he uses many mythical *exempla* other than Ulysses to characterize his wretched condition in exile. And yet the identification of himself as the composite of Homer and Ulysses is especially effective in invoking the combined authority of history—in the form of an actual poet—and of myth—in the form of a universal exile. For the historical and the mythical exist side by side in the exile poetry to the extent that the very distinction between history and myth begins to fade behind

[1] Videau-Delibes 1991, 13. Cf. Claassen 1999, Ch. 2. Perhaps noteworthy in this regard is that Ovid never puts the name "*Ouidius*" into verse, as for example in Mart. 1.105.1; 7.44.1.

[2] Ulysses is perhaps more readily associated with return (νόστος) than with banishment (φυγή), but he exhibits the distinguishing characteristic of the exile, the absence from home; see above, Intro. n. 41. Claassen 1999, 229, writes that Ovid's two *personae*, as "suffering exile" and "poet-exile," "coalesce into Ovid-the-poet."

an implicit principle of poetic composition that collapses the distance between actual experience and artistic representation.

In discussing the nature of Ovidian poetics and attempting to define the highly self-conscious character of his verse the question of how the poet uses myth is always germane. To cite perhaps the two most obvious examples, in the *Metamorphoses* Ovid draws on myth to explore the relationship of internal essence to external appearance in an epic world of shape-shifting forms, while in the *Heroides* he adopts the voices of famous mythic heroines (and later, of their lovers, *Epist.* 16–21) in mimetic exercises that use the epistolary form to respond to the existing literary tradition of Greece and Rome. In neither instance, however, does he appear *in propria persona*, which E.J. Kenney has identified as a distinctive feature of Ovidian poetics in exile.[3] In fact, in the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* Ovid inscribes himself into his poems to become, along with the *princeps* himself, a "mythical" figure akin to the numerous *exempla* from myth that fill these texts.[4] He calls this figure *Naso*, a composite of his dual role as both author and subject of the exile poetry, and effectively elides the conventional distinction between stylized poetry and lived experience: the poet's fate becomes his art and *vice versa*.[5] This point is made elegantly by Helmut Rahn in one of the most illuminating and influential articles to date on Ovid's elegiac epistles:

> an die Stelle des alten Spiels mythologischer Verkleidung [as in the *Heroides*] tritt ein neues, unvergleichbar gewichtigeres. … Neu kommt hinzu, dass die elegische *Epistel* zum *Mittel poetischer Selbstdarstellung* wird, dass der Verfasser in ihr sein *Schicksal als Dichtung* gestaltet und deutet.[6]

Rahn goes on to say that Ovid's art (*Kunst*) and his personal fate (*Schicksal*) cannot be separated in the exile poetry; rather the poet interprets

[3] Kenney 1982, 443. Ovid's exilic *persona*, appropriately called "das erzählende Ich" by Amann 2006, 45, is of course similar both to his "amatory elegiac ego in the *Amores*," so Hexter 2007, 210 n. 3 on the "elegisches Ich" of Chwalek 1996, 32–33, and to his erotodidactic *persona* in the *Ars* (2.744; 3.812: *Naso magister erat* "Naso was our teacher") and *Remedia* (71–72; 558).

[4] My observation resembles in certain aspects the conclusions of Ovid's "new myth of exile" reached by J.-M. Claassen's 1986 dissertation, which has been developed and refined in her articles from 1987, 1988, and 2001 and the relevant chapters from her book, *Displaced Persons* (1999), see above n. 2.

[5] Martindale 1988, 15: "Life has become subsumed into art." Cf. Heaney 1995, 6.

[6] Rahn 1958, 106 (emphasis his). Marg 1959, 348: "Ovid wird selber zu Dichter und Stoff." Kenney 1965b sets Ovid's mythologizing within the context of ancient literary convention, e.g. *Tr.* 1.6, on which see Hinds 1985, 27–28.

his situation with the means of expression (*Ausdrucksvermögen*) afforded by the forms inherited from the literary tradition (*Gestaltungsmöglichkeit*).[7]

Ovid and Homer

Homer was the most important poet in the Greek literary tradition and also held a central position in Latin poetry from its earliest days. The first Latin poet on record, Livius Andronicus, translated the *Odyssey* in the middle of the third century BC, at least a full generation before Ennius (c. 175 BC) began his *Annales* by relating a dream about the metempsychosis of Homer's soul into his own.[8] The Ennius passage was certainly memorable enough for Horace to compare Ennius to Homer in his famous letter to Augustus, *Epist.* 2.1.50–51: *Ennius, et sapiens et fortis et alter Homerus, / ut critici dicunt* "The critics call Ennius 'another Homer', both wise and accomplished in epic."[9] For Ovid's contemporary Strabo, moreover, Homer was the founder of the science of geography and surpassed all men for his excellence in poetry and his experience in the life of the polis, *Geog.* 1.2:

> καὶ πρῶτον ὅτι ὀρθῶς ὑπειλήφαμεν...ἀρχηγέτην εἶναι τῆς γεωγραφικῆς ἐμπειρίας Ὅμηρον· ὃς οὐ μόνον ἐν τῇ κατὰ τὴν ποίησιν ἀρετῇ πάντας ὑπερβέβληται τοὺς πάλαι καὶ τοὺς ὕστερον, ἀλλὰ σχεδόν τι καὶ τῇ κατὰ τόν βίον ἐμπειρίᾳ τὸν πολιτικόν
>
> And first [let me say] that we are right to have regarded Homer as the founder of geography; for he surpasses all men past and future not only in his excellence in poetry but, I dare say, even in his experience in what pertains to public life.

A similar sentiment is voiced later in the first century AD by Quintilian, for whom Homer represents the consummate artist, *Inst.* 12.11.21: *ut de Homero taceam, in quo nullius non artis aut opera perfecta aut certe non dubia uestigia reperiuntur* "I say nothing of Homer, in whose every art we find either works of perfection or, at any rate, no traces of weakness." This notion had been developed in the Hellenistic period where the figure of Homer was viewed as "a fountain-head from which later poets, men of

---

[7] Rahn 1958, 119.

[8] Enn. *Ann.* 2–10 Skutsch, esp. 8–10; cf. Porph. ad Hor. *Epist.* 2.1.51: *quod secundum Pythagorae dogma anima Homeri in suum corpus uenisset* "Because according to Pythagoras' teaching the soul of Homer had come into his own body."

[9] Cf. Brink 1982, 83–99, esp. 93, on the technical terminology used by the (probably Varronian) *critici.*

letters, philosophers had drunk."[10] The poet of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* was for Ovid and his contemporaries a paradigm for the learned man, a polymath, whose experience transcended poetry and was applied more generally to nearly every facet of life and culture.[11]

In the first book of the *Tristia* Ovid develops a series of references to Homer and the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* that come to shape the poetics of personal experience in the exile poetry. In terms of poetic genre, Homer represents epic, and it deserves to be noted here that elegy, both Greek and Roman, had traditionally defined itself against epic as what it was not.[12] But Ovid does not identify himself in the exile poetry with Homer in order to contravene the convention of the genre. The very personal nature of these poems shows him rather working within the generic parameters of the elegiac meter. At the same time, his identification with the epic poet derives from the focus in these poems on the personal suffering of the individual exile.[13] For Homer was considered in particular the greatest ancient authority on the topic of suffering in poetry.[14] Ovid adopts him as his authorial model here because he aims at presenting his own suffering in exile as extreme, nearly beyond comprehension in verse, and, in short, like the suffering in the Homeric epics.

Ovid's identification with Homer starts in the first poem of the collection in which the epic poet serves as the traditional measure of poetic capacity, *Tr.* 1.1.47–48:

---

[10] So Brink 1982, 93; cf. Feeney 1991, 44: "Certainly Homer, the master, was praised as containing all three levels of narrative (ἅπερ ἅπαντα παρὰ τῷ ποιητῇ ἐστι AbT 2.478–479). It was, in fact, conventional to regard epic as being a mixture of the actual and the invented, or false, and hence as containing elements of narrative style appropriate to more than one level: thus, Polybius defines Homer's poetic licence as 'a mixture of history, description, and myth' (συνέστηκεν ἐξ ἱστορίας καὶ διαθέσεως καὶ μύθου. 34.4.1)."

[11] Galinsky 1998, 327, goes so far as to state that Ovid's whole poetic program in the *Metamorphoses* is to recreate and reunite the various literary forms—poetry, history, philosophy, rhetoric—which originated with Homer. See also Galinsky 1996, 262, for more on this point.

[12] Cf. *OCD*[3] s.v. "elegiac poetry, Latin" (E.J. Kenney / S. Hinds): "To some extent, as in Greek, the elegiac couplet is an all-purpose metre, save that its sphere of operation can often be defined negatively as 'not epic' ... epic is constantly immanent within elegy as the term against which it defines itself."

[13] See Harrison 2002, 90: "If *Tristia* I is concerned to differentiate itself from love-elegy, it is also concerned to assimilate itself to epic."

[14] Galasso 1995, 327 ad *Pont.* 2.7.33–34: *quae [mala] tibi si memori coner perscribere uersu, / Ilias est fati longa futura mei* "If I tried to relate to you in verse all that I

> da mihi Maeoniden et tot circumice casus,
> ingenium tantis excidet omne malis.
>
> Let's take Homer, for example, and throw as many misfortunes about him; all his genius will fall away amid such great suffering.[15]

For Ovid in exile, poetic capacity is not a question of talent alone (*ingenium*) but of suffering as well (*mala*). Indeed, it was proverbial in Greek to speak of "an Iliad of suffering" (Ἰλιὰς κακῶν) because that poem was viewed as containing a "myriad of ills" (μυρία κακά).[16] In the annals of literature the city of Troy clearly conjured up Homer, and Ovid uses its storied fall as a point of comparison for the ruin exile brings upon his house and family in the duly famous third poem of the *Tristia*'s first book, 1.3.25–26:

> si licet exemplis in paruo grandibus uti,
> haec facies Troiae, cum caperetur, erat.
>
> If it is permitted in a lowly case to use lofty examples, Troy looked like this when she was taken.[17]

In the recent history of Latin poetry, however, Troy also meant Vergil, who had connected its rebirth in myth to the Augustan refounding of the Roman republic. In the above passage, Ovid is alluding,

---

remember suffering, there would be a long *Iliad* of my misfortune," notes "L'Iliade è proverbialmente il poema che contiene in massimo grado tragedie smisurate."

[15] See also *Tr.* 1.6.31–32: *siquid et in nobis uiui fuit ante uigoris, / extinctum longis excidit omne malis*! "If I had any lively vigor before, that has been crushed and lost entirely amid my long suffering." The complaint comes even before Ovid has reached Tomis and demonstrates the poet's concern with the artistic representation of his suffering over fidelity to lived experience.

[16] E.g. Plut. *coniug. praec.* 21 (141A): Φιλόπλουτος ἡ Ἑλένη, φιλήδονος ὁ Πάρις· φρόνιμος ὁ Ὀδυσσεύς, σώφρων ἡ Πηνελόπη. διὰ τοῦτο μακάριος γάμος ὁ τοῦτων καὶ ζηλωτός, ὁ δ' ἐκείνων Ἰλιάδα κακῶν Ἕλλησι καὶ βαρβάροις ἐποίησεν. "Helen was fond of wealth and Paris of pleasure, while Odysseus was prudent and Penelope modest, for which reason Odyseus and Penelope had a happy marriage, worthy of envy, while the marriage of Paris and Helen brought an Iliad of evils to Greeks and non-Greeks alike." Galasso 1995, 327, cites Zenobius, a sophist and paroemiographer in the time of Hadrian, who included the proverb in his collection, *vulg.* 4.43: Ἰλιὰς κακῶν] ἀπὸ παροιμίας τοῦτο ἐλέγετο ἐπὶ τῶν μεγάλων κακῶν· παρόσον ἐν Ἰλίῳ μυρία κακὰ συνέβη "An Iliad of suffering: according to the proverb this is said about a great deal of suffering in so far as a myriad of suffering happened at Ilium."

[17] The contrast of small to large was Ovid's specialty, as in the first poem of the exilic corpus, which opens, *Tr.* 1.1.1: *parue—nec inuideo—sine me, liber, ibis in Vrbem* "You will go to Rome, little book, and I don't resent you for it." Ovid's little work goes to great Rome.

tongue-in-cheek, to the account of the fall of Troy from *Aeneid* 2.[18] There are many ways to show how Vergil's monumental epic (*grande*) is written in the spirit of Homer, but at least one approach suggests that the type of suffering (*labor*) Aeneas had to undergo to set the founding of Rome in motion was readily associated with the action of the Homeric epics (πόνος). Against these lofty examples Ovid's personal experience in exile was destined to count as insignificant (*paruum*). Of course, there is a certain aesthetic to the "insignificant trifle" with a long tradition in Greek and Latin poetry that Ovid was certainly aware of and seems to play upon here. There lies behind this passage and the rest of the poem—as well as the entire Ovidian œuvre—the knowledge that the Alexandrians had developed an entire aesthetic program of artistic refinement on a reduced scale, most frequently associated with the poet Callimachus and often expressed in Greek by κατὰ λεπτόν "in a pared-down fashion." Added to this was the understanding among the ancients that the artistic compass of the elegist was meant to be small by comparison with the epic poet's. The apparent contrast in the aesthetics of the genre of elegy (*viz.* the elegiac epistle) and the genre of epic (*viz.* the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*) is important for understanding this passage as well as the arguments of this chapter.

At the same time, Ovid also seems to be alluding in the above passage from *Tristia* 1.3 to Vergil's own overtly Alexandrian undertaking, the *Eclogues*, 1.23: *sic paruis componere magna solebam* "so was I wont to compare great things to small." The comparison of small to great is a common motif in Greek and Latin literature which had achieved proverbial status in both languages by the time Ovid was writing, and one has to be cautious in pressing the issue of intertextuality here.[19] Still, an allusion to Vergil in this context at the outset of the *Tristia* and

---

[18] The representation of suffering in the rest of the poem, as so often in the exile poetry, seems too overwrought to elicit actual pity (though Goethe is said to have left Rome in tears while reading this poem) and strikes a humorous rather than somber tone, e.g. 23–24: *femina uirque meo, pueri quoque funere maerent, / inque domo lacrimas angulus omnis habet* "husband and wife, children too, weep at my death, and every corner of the house is filled with tears," and his wife's actions upon his departure resemble Priam's in *Il.* 22.401 or the language of Verg. *A.* 12.99, as she grieves for her exiled husband, 93–94: *utque resurrexit foedatis puluere turpi / crinibus et gelida membra leuauit humo* "when she rose, her hair covered with foul dirt, and lifted her limbs from the cold ground."

[19] Cf. Otto 1890, 1008; Clausen 1994, ad *Ecl.* 1.23, where he adduces *G.* 4.176: *si parua licet componere magnis* "if it is permitted to compare small to great," and *Tr.* 1.6.28: *grandia si paruis adsimilare licet* "if it is permitted to liken great to small," and Luck 1977 ad *Tr.* 1.3.25–26.

the exile poetry in general serves to remind the reader that Ovid is leaving the new Troy, which is Rome or the *magna* in Tityrus' comparison from the *Eclogues*. As the passage from Vergil continues, Tityrus reproaches himself for his folly in thinking that he could gather an idea of the greatness of Rome by imagining his own small city on a larger scale, *Ecl.* 1.24–25:

> uerum haec [*sc. Roma*] tantum alias inter caput extulit urbes
> quantum lenta solent inter uiburna cupressi.
>
> But the city of Rome has raised her head as far above all other cities as the cypress tree is wont to rear over the slow-growing hobblebush.

To Meliboeus' question in the following verse, 26: *et quae tanta fuit Romam tibi causa uidendi?* "and why was it so important for you to see Rome?" he responds proudly, 27: *Libertas* "Freedom." The subject of Tityrus' jubilant exclamation, "*libertas*," the cry not just of a liberated slave but of a Roman (citizen) set free from the tyranny of a protracted civil war, is a thing of the past for Ovid or perhaps something he never even knew or had much concern about. Over forty years separate his *Tristia* from the publication of Vergil's *Eclogues* in about the mid 30s BC, and much had changed at Rome in the intervening period. The precipitous nature of his downfall and his forced departure from Rome, however, made Ovid conscious of the value of *libertas* even as Vergil had envisioned it. And as Vergil was duly conscious of his models, be they Hellenistic or Homeric or both, so too was Ovid intent on responding to the literary tradition in which he wanted above all to make his name.

Because Homer sits at the head of that tradition, Ovid is especially keen to recreate the epic poet's presence in his final body of poems from exile. I have already begun to trace this process in *Tristia* 1.1 and 1.3 and turn now to the fifth poem of the same book.[20] There the issue of poetic ability is framed in terms of Homer's famous invocation of the Muses that introduces the list of heroes from the catalogue of ships in *Iliad* 2.488–490:

---

[20] This poem is crucial to the dissussion of the Ulysses-motif below, on which see Williams 1994, 104–115, e.g. 113–114: "The only valid point of comparison between Ovid and Ulysses here is their shared capacity for beguiling rhetoric … In the light of Ovid's unequivocal commitment to *fides* in friendship in the first part of *Tr.* 1.5, his subsequent attempt to induce belief in the unbelievable marks an ironic change of direction. Equivocal in his commitment to *fides* in the sense of his own credibility as a poet, he now draws on mythology as a fictional construct against which he can assert the alleged 'reality' of his own exilic circumstances; myth is no longer a source of gnomic truth (cf. 31–32), but of patent falsehood (cf. 79–80)."

> πληθὺν δ᾽ οὐκ ἂν ἐγὼ μυθήσομαι οὐδ᾽ ὀνομήνω,
> οὐδ᾽ εἴ μοι δέκα μὲν γλῶσσαι, δέκα δὲ στόματ᾽ εἶεν,
> φωνὴ δ᾽ ἄρρηκτος, χάλκεον δέ μοι ἦτορ ἐνείη
>
> But the multitude I could not tell or name, not if I had ten tongues and ten mouths and an unbreakable voice and a heart of bronze within me.

Homer's "many-mouths" passage was renowned in antiquity and had often been imitated by Latin poets starting with Ennius.[21] By the time Ovid was writing it had become a *topos*, which he himself had already used in the *Ars* (1.433–436), *Fasti* (2.119–120), and *Metamorphoses* (8.533–534).[22] In the following passage he can be seen wading through the morass of the several previous adaptations among Latin poets to redirect the reader's focus back to Homer *and* the hero Ulysses, *Tr.* 1.5.53–56:

> si uox infragilis, pectus mihi firmius aere,
>   pluraque cum linguis pluribus ora forent,
> non tamen idcirco conplecterer omnia uerbis,
>   materia uires exsuperante meas.
>
> If I had an unbreakable voice, a heart stronger than bronze, and a plurality of mouths with a plurality of tongues, not even then could I comprehend it all in words, for the material outdoes my strength.

Ovid does not change the metal from bronze to iron as Ennius and Vergil had done,[23] and though he substitutes Homer's ten tongues with a generic "plurality," the word he uses, *plura*, picks up the Homeric πληθύς. The emphasis here, as in Homer, is still on the sheer countlessness of the subject, although Ovid has subtly added another dimension to his use of the "many-mouths" *topos*: his *materia* is not merely countless like the names of the heroes that fought at Troy; it is also filled with suffering, in particular his own personal suffering. In this respect—as he goes on to say in the rest of the poem—he is most like to one of

[21] For parallel passages, see Williams 1994, 111 n. 17 and Luck 1977, ad 1.5.53–54, e.g. Hostius (late 2nd cent. BC) in Macrob. 6.3.6 [fr. 3 Courtney]: *non si mihi linguae / centum atque ora sient totidem uocesque liquatae* "not if I had a hundred tongues, and a like number of mouths and melodious voices;" *Pont.* 4.15.5–6; Pers. 5.1–4.

[22] Cf. Hinds 1998, 34–47, for a discussion of some of these passages and the problems with the term "*topos*" in the study of Roman poetry.

[23] Enn. *Ann.* 469–470 Skutsch: *non si lingua loqui saperet quibus, ora decem sint / in me, tum ferro cor sit pectusque reuinctum* "not if I had ten mouths with which my tongue knew how to speak, and my heart and chest were bound by iron;" Verg. *G.* 2.43–44 = *A.* 6.625–626: *non, mihi si linguae centum sint oraque centum, / ferrea uox* "not if I had a hundred tongues, a hundred mouths, and a voice of iron."

Homer's most famous heroes, Ulysses. Indeed, there lurks underneath Ovid's use of the "many-mouths" *topos* here not only the recognition that his sufferings are innumerable, but that they are sufferings of a kind even Homer could have written about and, in fact, did write about in his epic on the adventures of Ulysses.[24]

The poet is apparently engaged here in metapoetic commentary regarding his status as poet on the one hand and as exile on the other: in his capacity as poet (*ingenium*), Ovid is like Homer; in the amount of his suffering in exile (*mala*), he is like Ulysses.[25] Hence, in the distich that follows the "many-mouths" passage, Ovid suggests a comparison between his own ills and those suffered by Ulysses, *Tr.* 1.5.57–58:

> pro duce Neritio docti mala nostra poetae
> scribite. Neritio nam mala plura tuli.

> Write, learned poets, about my misfortunes instead of Ulysses'; for I have suffered more ills than he.

By addressing his complaint to other learned poets, *docti poetae*, Ovid implies that his own ills are worthy of poetry just as Ulysses' were. The address, however, is first and foremost an address to himself, for he is the author (*poeta doctus*) of his own suffering. He has become, in effect, his own Homer, and if Ovid's own "mythical" suffering is even more intense and hence more worthy of poetic renown than Ulysses', his poetic art is by implication able to outdo, or at the very least, to vie with Homer's.[26]

---

[24] My reading here is greatly indebted to Hinds 1998, 41–46, esp. 45: "Can it not then be argued that the 'many-mouths' *topos* has generated a subset *topos* encoding, not just countlessness, but the countlessness of *woe*?" (emphasis his) It deserves note here that embedded in *Tr.* 1.1 is a reference to Ovid as Ulysses, 114: *Oedipodas facito Telegonosque uoces* "call [the books of the *Ars*] by the name of 'Oedipus' or 'Telegonus'," *i.e.* unwitting parricides. For just as Ulysses' son, Telegonus, is reputed to have killed his father inadvertently, so too has the *Ars* brought about the unforeseen death of its "father," Ovid, on which again see Hinds 1985, 17–20.

[25] Ulysses also appears in the first book of the *Tristia* at 1.2.9–10 amidst a mythical catalogue familiar from Ovid's exile poetry. The catalogue links the poet's own ills at sea to instances from myth where the help of one god offsets the persecution of another. In contrast to mythical figures such as Ulysses, Ovid has no help in facing the wrath of the (divine) Augustus.

[26] Rahn 1958, 117, notes that Ovid tends to outdo the mythical *exempla* he adduces, e.g. *Pont.* 1.4.9–10: *nam mea per longos siquis mala digerat annos, / crede mihi, Pylio Nestore maior ero* "for if anyone should tally my suffering over the long years—believe me—I'd be older than Pylian Nestor," a point reiterated by Graf 2002, 114–115.

Clearly, any qualitative comparison of the two is as inappropriate now as it would have been in Ovid's day. Still, for the rest of the passage (and the poem) Ovid demonstrates his own poetic talent in relation to Homer's by employing the pointed argumentation of a polished orator to prove the worth of his own mythical status in relation to Ulysses', *Tr.* 1.5.59–84:

ille breui spatio multis errauit in annis
    inter Dulichias Iliacasque domos:
nos freta sideribus totis distantia mensos
    sors tulit in Geticos Sarmaticosque sinus.
ille habuit fidamque manum sociosque fideles:
    me profugum comites deseruere mei.
ille suam laetus patriam uictorque petebat:
    a patria fugi uictus et exul ego.
nec mihi Dulichium domus est Ithaceue Samosue,
    poena quibus non est grandis abesse locis:
sed quae de septem totum circumspicit orbem
    montibus, imperii Roma deumque locus.
illi corpus erat durum patiensque laborum:
    inualidae uires ingenuaeque mihi.
ille erat assidue saeuis agitatus in armis:
    adsuetus studiis mollibus ipse fui.
me deus oppressit, nullo mala nostra leuante:
    bellatrix illi diua ferebat opem.
cumque minor Ioue sit tumidis qui regnat in undis,
    illum Neptuni, me Iouis ira premit.
adde, quod illius pars maxima ficta laborum
    ponitur in nostris fabula nulla malis.
denique quaesitos tetigit tamen ille Penates,
    quaeque diu petiit, contigit arua tamen:
at mihi perpetuo patria tellure carendum est,
    ni fuerit laesi mollior ira dei.

His wanderings were confined to a small space—between the homes of Dulichium and Ilium—spread out over many years; I've traversed seas separated by entire constellations and been banished by fate to Getic and Sarmatian shores. He had a faithful band of steadfast companions; I've been abandoned by my comrades. Happy in his victory, he made for his native land; I've had to flee mine, undone by exile as I am. Besides, my home's not on Dulichium, Ithaca or Same, places from which it is no great punishment to be away; it's in Rome, looking over the whole world from her seven hills, in Rome, the home of empire and of gods! His body was hard enough to endure toil; my life-force is weak and tender. He was constantly engaged in brutal warfare; I've been used to more delicate pursuits. When the god crushed me, no one lightened my suffering; to him the goddess of war used to bring help. And as Neptune, the ruler of

the swelling waves, is lesser than Jupiter, so was he harried by Neptune's anger, as I am now by Jupiter's. Add the fact that most of his labors are made up, while there's no myth in my woes. And finally, he reached the home he was trying to find, and in the end touched the land he had sought for so long. But I must go forever without my native soil, unless the wrath of the injured god be softened.

The rhetorical *amplificatio* the poet employs here to make his own suffering seem greater than Ulysses' makes, in the end, an analogy out of an antithesis: Ovid is, on the surface, worse off than Ulysses, and yet their experiences overlap in so many aspects that the similarities outweigh the differences. Augustus, for example, is Ovid's Jupiter to match, or rather to outdo, Ulysses' Neptune, who in contrast to the divine dealer of Ovid's woes is himself powerless to prevent the intervention of other gods wanting to help the Homeric hero (75–76).[27] In both cases the wrath of a god brings about the abject suffering that attends exile. A similar idea resurfaces two books later in *Tr.* 3.11.59–62:

tot mala sum fugiens tellure, tot aequore passus,
  te quoque ut auditis posse dolere putem.
crede mihi, si sit nobis collatus Vlixes,
  Neptuni minor est quam Iouis ira fuit.

In exile I've suffered as many ills on land as on the sea that I think that you too would be able to feel grief upon hearing them. Compare Ulysses to me: believe me, Neptune's anger is less than Jupiter's has been.

Ovid's state of suffering, it seems, is a prerequisite for his poems from exile just as Ulysses' wandering is necessary for the first half of the *Odyssey*.[28] More generally, the allusions to the figure of Homer that begin to appear early on in the first book of the *Tristia* and the direct analogy Ovid makes between himself and Ulysses suggest a stylized representation of exile that is very conscious of its literary models and overall design. Unlike the hero's fate in Homer's *Odyssey*, however, in Ovid's case there will be no *nostos* nor any restitution of order at home.[29]

One reading of the long passage from *Tr.* 1.5 quoted above suggests that the fundamental difference in the construction of Homer's *Odyssey* and the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* can be reformulated into what Ovid

---

[27] Cf. *Pont.* 3.6.19–20: *nec, quia Neptunus nauem lacerarat Vlixis, / Leucothea nanti ferre negauit opem* "When Neptune had destroyed Ulysses' ship, Leucothea did not fail to bring him help in the water."

[28] Cf. Williams 1994, 67: "Ovid is in Odysseus' position of having to fulfill an epic destiny."

[29] Williams 1994, 109.

calls Ulysses' *ficta* (made-up stories or myths) and his own *nulla fabula* (non-myth or actual experience). The contrast between *nulla fabula* and *ficta* corresponds rather patly to a distinction that emerges from the first book of the *Tristia* between Ovid as poet (Homer) and Ovid as exile (Ulysses). But the poetological scheme at work here, whereby Ovid has collapsed the figures of Homer and Ulysses into a single poetic persona, *Naso uates et exul*, creates the impression that there is no longer any distance between the poet and his experience, that is, between the author and the subject. This is not unlike what Homer does in the *Odyssey* with the figure of Odysseus, who tells the story of his own wanderings at the court of Alcinous (*Od.* 9–12). But even there, Homer remains the omniscient author at a considerable remove from his narrating subject. Of course, Ulysses was also notorious for his ability to tell lies, and indeed, when Ovid claims that he only experiences what actually happened (*nulla fabula*) and that there is nothing made up in his verse (*ficta*), the reader should be skeptical.[30] In fact, he invites a certain degree of skepticism from those familiar with his earlier work by stating in his open appeal to the emperor that most of his own poetry is fictional, *Tr.* 2.355: *magnaque pars mendax operum est et ficta meorum* "most of my work is untrue and made-up."[31] In this passage, of course, he is playing up to the *princeps* with an eye to exonerating from blame the work, the *Ars*, that was part of the dual charge that brought about his banishment from Rome. And yet clearly a similar mixture of truth and untruth continues to apply to the poetry of his exile. In fact, the *materia* of Ovid's exile poetry is a similar combination of *ficta* and *non fabulosa*, the verbal nexus that furnishes Ulysses as mythical subject and Homer as actual

[30] Cf. Rosenmeyer 1997, 50–51.

[31] Cf. *Am.* 3.12.19, 41–42: *nec tamen ut testes mos est audire poetas ... exit in immensum fecunda licentia uatum, / obligat historica nec sua uerba fide* "and yet it is not customary to listen to the testimony of poets ... the imaginative freedom of sacred bards goes beyond measure and does not fetter its words with the credit of history." But cf. *Pont.* 3.9.47–50: *denique materiam quam quis sibi finxerit ipse, / arbitrio uariat multa poeta suo. / Musa mea est index nimium quoque uera malorum / atque incorrupti pondera testis habet* "In the end every poet varies according to his own judgment the subject he has made for himself. My Muse is a mark—all too true—of my misfortune and has the weight of an incorruptible witness." Something has changed for Ovid in exile; there is no longer any distinction between poetry and experience, the one is fully representative of the other and *vice versa*, *Tr.* 5.1.3: *hic* [libellus] *quoque talis erit, qualis fortuna poetae: / inuenies toto carmine dulce nihil* "this book too is like the fate of its poet: you will find nothing sweet in all the poetry;" *Tr.* 5.12.36: [carmina] *digna sui domini tempore, digna loco* "the poetry is worthy of both its author and the place;" and cf. *Tr.* 3.14.51–52; 4.1.1–2.

author. For that which has been made up and is therefore unreal (*ficta*) is no impediment to truth in poetry, just as in the same context that which purports to be actual experience (*nulla fabula*) is no guarantee of veracity.

The problem here stems from the convergence of myth and history and goes back to the distinction drawn earlier in this study between the representation of the actual and the universal in literature.[32] According to Aristotle (*Poet.* 9 [1451b]), history deals with the actual alone, while poetry contains both. Of course, Ovid is writing neither an epic nor a tragedy—Aristotle's poetic norms—but elegies of a very personal kind. Still, he seems intent on capturing the suffering, both mental and physical, that is inherent to the experience of every exile. This accounts for the looming presence in these poems of the figure of Ulysses who had become a (primarily Stoic) paradigm for the suffering that results from the separation from home, the defining condition of exile. It also explains the several references early in the first book of the *Tristia* to the figure of Homer, who was viewed in antiquity as the consummate artist, a polymath with a poetic œuvre that contained the fill of human experiences. By bringing together the author and subject of the *Odyssey* as parallel figures to himself as author and subject of the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* Ovid invokes the authority of antiquity's paradigmatic poet and the experience of antiquity's paradigmatic exile. In doing so, he is making a statement about the poems he sends back to Rome from Pontus: they comprehend the sum of human suffering brought on by exile. In effect, the poet turns his personal experience into something universal with the scope of Homer's poems; in terms of the κλέος or undying fame that motivates the action in the Homeric epics, taking on such a broad vision for his poetry also involves being immortalized by fame.

The issue of poetic immortality had been one of Ovid's central concerns from his earliest poems and continued to be of the utmost importance for him in his later ones.[33] This is certainly the case for the poet's wish to live on after death in the closing verses of the *Metamorphoses*

[32] See Ch. 1 30–32.

[33] See Kenney 1982, 420–422; 447–449; and despite Ovid's claims to the contrary, *Pont.* 3.9.46, 55–56: *uilior est operis fama salute mea /… / da ueniam scriptis, quorum non gloria nobis/ causa, sed utilitas officiumque fuit* "cheaper is the reputation of the work than my well-being … excuse what I've written, which I did not for glory but because I had to for expediency."

(15.878–879: *fama ... uiuam*), a wish he carries with him into his work from exile.[34] In the first book of the *Tristia*, for example, the issue of poetic immortality is addressed in Ovid's first letter to his wife, *Tr.* 1.6.21–22:

> tu si Maeonium uatem sortita fuisses,
> Penelopes esset fama secunda tuae.

> If you had been allotted the Homeric bard, Penelope's renown would be second to yours.

Just as the poet likens himself wandering into exile to Ulysses, so too is his wife likened to Penelope awaiting the return of her lost husband. Ovid is the *Ersatz*-Homer (*Maeonius uates*) for her just as he is the new Homer for his own Ulysses-like suffering. The implication of these analogies becomes clear at the end of the poem, where the poet writes, 35–36:

> quantumcumque tamen praeconia nostra ualebunt,
> carminibus uiues tempus in omne meis.

> Yet to the extent that my public declarations have power, you will live on forever in my poetry.

As in the case of Penelope and the mythical figures that populate the poems of Homer (e.g. 19–20: *Hectoris uxor ... comes Laudamia*), Ovid's wife will attain immortality by virtue of being the subject of his poetry. Herein lies the significance of becoming "mythical" like the subjects of Homer's poems, stated most memorably by Helen in the *Iliad*, 6.357–358:

---

[34] Cf. *Tr.* 3.4a.45–46: *Nasonisque tui, quod adhuc non exulat unum, / nomen ama: Scythicus cetera Pontus habet* "cherish the name of your Naso, which alone is still not in exile: Scythia's Black Sea holds the rest;" 3.10.2: *et superest sine me nomen in urbe meum* "my name survives without me in Rome;" 5.14.5–6: *dumque legar, mecum pariter tua fama legetur, / nec potes in maestos omnis abire rogos* "and as long as I'm read, your fame will be read together with me, and you cannot disappear entirely in the sad funeral pyre;" *Pont.* 3.2.29–30: *fallor, et illa meae superabit* [sc. gratia meriti Cottae] *tempora uitae, / si tamen a memori posteritate legar* "I'm mistaken: Cotta's thanks will survive my life's span, if a mindful posterity continues to read me;" 4.7.53–54: *uincitur Aegisos, testataque tempus in omne / sunt tua, Vestalis, carmine facta meo* "Aegisos is conquered, and for all time, Vestalis, my poetry bears witness to your deeds." See, too, his prayer for the *Metamorphoses*, *Tr.* 1.7.25–26: *nunc precor ut uiuant et non ignaua legentem / otia delectent admoneantque mei* "now I pray that they may live and that my active leisure may delight the reader and remind him of me;" and similarly, *Tr.* 3.14.23–24: *nunc incorrectum* [opus = *Met.*] *populi peruenit in ora, / in populi quicquam si tamen ore mei est* "now the unrevised edition has reached people's lips, if there is still anything of mine on their lips."

οἷσιν ἐπὶ Ζεὺς θῆκε κακὸν μόρον, ὡς καὶ ὀπίσσω
ἀνθρώποισι πελώμεθ' ἀοίδιμοι ἐσσομένοισι.

Upon whom Zeus has put this evil fate that even after this we might become the subject of song for men yet to come.

Both Ovid and his wife—like Helen, Paris, and Hector from the above passage in Homer—have become the subject of song, ἀοίδιμοι, by virtue of the evil fate, κακὸς μόρος, set upon them by the poet's exile. As with Ovid's direct identification with the suffering of Ulysses, it is Helen's suffering that makes her think herself worthy of song and, ultimately, of immortality.[35] It is no surprise, given the identification of the divine *princeps* with Jupiter in the exile poetry, that Augustus, as the exiling agent and the author of Ovid's evil fate, corresponds to the figure of Zeus in Helen's observation.

But the composite of Homer and Ulysses that Ovid attempts to incorporate into his own poetic persona in the first of book of the *Tristia* offers more than another vehicle for poetic immortality. The poet's identification with the figure of Homer suggests that he also has access to a special type of knowledge, and this may very well explain why the prophetic figure of the *uates* first appears in the exile poetry as the Homeric bard, *Tr.* 1.6.21: *Maeonium uatem.* Of course, the knowledge associated with the figure of Homer in Ovid's day was not simply that of a poet but of a philosopher and orator as well: he was a polymath and an expert in human character. By combining Homer and Ulysses in his poetic persona in exile Ovid aspires to a universalizing poetics, one that pushes his own art into the realm of Homer's, the consummate artist, and places his pretensions to fame on par with Ulysses', the immortalized myth.

Such grand claims, moreover, are not limited to the first book of the *Tristia* but can be found throughout the exile poetry. In *Tristia* 2, for example, Ovid relates his own love poetry to the epic poems that

---

[35] For the same idea, in another letter to his wife on the occasion of her birthday, see *Tr.* 5.5.51–52: *si nihil infesti durus uidisset Ulixes, / Penelope felix sed sine laude foret* "If hardy Ulysses had met no hostility, Penelope would have been happy but unremembered;" and more generally on the poetic immortality of Homeric (and Ovidian) heroines, see *Tr.* 5.14.35–38: *aspicis ut longo teneat laudabilis aeuo / nomen inextinctum Penelopea fides? / cernis ut Admeti cantetur et Hectoris uxor / ausaque in accensos Iphias ire rogos? / ut uiuat fama coniunx Phylaceia, cuius / Iliacem celeri uir pede pressit humum?* "See for how long a time Penelope's fidelity keeps her name alive? See how the wives of Admetus and Hector are sung and Iphias' daughter dared to enter the burning pyre? How the fame of Laodamia lives, whose husband set his swift foot on Trojan ground?" Cf. *Pont.* 3.1.105–114.

Homer wrote. He offers the emperor an excuse for his own erotic verse, the *Ars* in particular, by imagining the elegiac lover's utterly ridiculous, though amusing interpretations of the Homeric poems: the *Iliad* becomes nothing more than the tale of an adulteress over whom the lover and the husband had a tiff; the *Odyssey* is but the pursuit of a woman by many men while the husband is away.[36] Homer becomes a measure against which the proper way of reading can be tested, and in consequence Ovid identifies himself as a defendant with the epic poet in order to underscore the importance of his individual case for the future of poetry at Rome. In a sense, all poetry is on trial under Augustus, and Homer, as the all-poet, has been duly summoned to the defense team. Again, in his autobiographical poem, *Tr.* 4.10, Ovid's father attempts to inculcate the value of money and a good job in his son and finds a way to impugn the poetic art by claiming that Homer died poor.[37] Then in the final book of the exilic corpus, the poet revisits once more the analogy between himself and Homer, *Pont.* 4.2.21–22:

> si quis in hac ipsum terra posuisset Homerum,
> esset—crede mihi—factus et ille Getes.

> If someone had put Homer himself in this land, that one too—believe me—would have become a Getan.[38]

For the exiled Ovid, however, alone and at a far remove from home, the figure of Ulysses offers the most resonant correspondences.[39] This

---

[36] *Tr.* 2.371–380: *Ilias ipsa quid est aliud, nisi adultera, de qua / inter amatorem pugna uirumque fuit? / quid prius est illi flamma Briseidos, utque / fecerit iratos rapta puella duces? / aut quid Odyssea est, nisi femina propter amorem, / dum uir abest, multis una petita uiris? / quis, nisi Maeonides, Venerem Martemque ligatos / narrat in obsceno corpora prensa toro? / unde nisi indicio magni sciremus Homeri / hospitis igne duas incaluisse deas*? "What else is the *Iliad* itself but the story of an adulteress, over whom her husband and lover fought? What does it have before the fire for Briseis, when the taking of the girl caused the leaders to rage? Or what is the *Odyssey* but the story of many suitors pursuing one woman whose husband is away? Who but Homer tells of the trapping of Venus and Mars, their bodies caught in lewd sex? From where else but from the pages of great Homer would we know that two goddesses grew hot with passion for their guest?"

[37] *Tr.* 4.10.21–22: *saepe pater dixit 'studium quid inutile temptas? / Maeonides nullas ipse reliquit opes'* "Often my father said, 'why do you keep at this useless pursuit? Homer himself died poor'."

[38] See also *Pont.* 3.3.31–32: *nec me Maeonio consurgere carmine nec me / dicere magnorum passus es* [Amor] *acta ducum* "you did not allow me, Cupid, to reach the heights of Homeric verse or to sing the deeds of great leaders."

[39] E.g. *Tr.* 3.11.61–62; 5.5.3,51–52; *Pont.* 1.3 *passim*, 2.7.60; 3.1.35–36; 3.6.19–20; 4.10.9–38, 4.14.35–36; 4.16.13–14. A full catalogue of passages with the Ulysses figure—and all other mythic figures!—is to be found in Claassen 2001, especially 33: "Odysseus,

of course led Helmut Rahn to identify the "*Odysseus-Rolle*" as the most important of the many mythemes based on heroes from literature that unite the individual books from exile.[40] I have already noted how Ovid uses Homer's hero as a mythical *exemplum* to show, with a good measure of irony, that his own suffering outdoes the immense suffering that Ulysses is said to have endured and that also brought him great renown.[41] This is perhaps clearest in the final book of the collection, *Pont.* 4.10.9–30:

Exemplum est animi nimium patientis Vlixes
  iactatus dubio per duo lustra mari,
tempora solliciti sed non tamen omnia fati
  pertulit et placidae saepe fuere morae.
An graue sex annis pulchram fouisse Calypson
  aequoreaeque fuit concubuisse deae?
Excipit Hippotades qui dat pro munere uentos,
  curuet ut inpulsos utilis aura sinus.
Nec bene cantantis labor est audire puellas
  nec degustanti lotos amara fuit.
Hos ego qui patriae faciant obliuia sucos
  parte meae uitae, si modo dentur, emam.
Nec tu contuleris urbem Laestrygonos umquam
  gentibus obliqua quas obit Hister aqua,
nec uincet Cyclops saeuum feritate Piacchen;
  qui quota terroris pars solet esse mei?
Scylla feris trunco quod latret ab inguine monstris,
  Heniochae nautis plus nocuere rates.
Nec potes infestis conferre Charybdin Achaeis,
  ter licet epotum ter uomat illa fretum;
qui quamquam dextra regione licentius errant,
  securum latus hoc non tamen esse sinunt.

---

or rather the Ovidian Ulysses, is the most important recurrent symbol for the storm-tossed exile," and 57 with Table 6.

40 Rahn 1958, 116: "*die Odysseus-Rolle steht nicht auf einer Stufe mit den anderen von ihm genannten Heroen … sondern ist so etwas wie ein Leitmotiv, das zur inneren Einheit der Bücher aus der Verbannungszeit wesentlich beiträgt*." He offers suggestions for further study, 118: "*die Scheltgedichte gegen untreue Freunde in der Heimat, die den Freiern in der Odysseus-Rolle entsprechen, und kontrastierend eingeordnet sind* (*Tr.* 1.8; 3.11; 4.7.9; 5.8, cf. *Pont.* 4.3)," and *Pont.* 2.9.41 where Cotys plays the role of Alcinous. Cf. Helzle 2003, 16–17; ib. 1989, 44, for a reminiscence of *Od.* 8.461–462, Nausicaa's parting words to Odysseus, in the opening of *Pont.* 4.1.2; Hexter 1986, 83 n. 1.

41 Cf. also *Pont.* 2.7.60: *non Ithacae puppi saeuior unda fuit* "not towards Ulysses' ship was the sea more savage."

> The measure of extreme mental anguish is Ulysses because he was tossed about on the treacherous seas for a full ten years. And yet he didn't spend all his time agonizing over his fate, but there were often intervals of peace. Or was it difficult to snuggle with Calypso and to sleep with a goddess of the sea for six years? The son of Hippotes took him in and gave him winds as a gift so that a helpful breeze might fill his sails and drive on his ship. Surely, it's no burden to hear maidens sing in tune, nor did the lotus taste bitter to those who tried it.[42] For half of my life I'd buy that juice to make me forget my homeland, if only it were being offered. And you could never compare the Laestrygonians' city with the tribes you meet along the winding Danube. Not even the Cyclops, I tell you, will outdo the ferocity of savage Piacches—and he's but a fraction of my reasons to fear! The monstrous Scylla may bark wildly from her mutilated loins, but the ships of the Heniochi have actually done more harm to sailors. Nor could you compare Charybdis—albeit a monster that takes three gulps of the sea which she then spews back—to the hostile Achaei, who though they range more freely in the eastern region do not even allow this side of the Black Sea to be safe.

The material from the *Odyssey* gives Ovid the opportunity to show off his learning and technical virtuosity as in the lengthy passage concerning Ulysses from *Tristia* 1.5 discussed above. The poet however does not repeat any of the examples from the *Odyssey* that he used earlier but composes this passage as a counterpoise to that one. Both passages may be said to punctuate the period of his banishment—as they punctuate the first and last books of the exilic corpus—by defining the experience of his suffering there in relation to Ulysses, the paradigmatic sufferer from Greek myth.

In this poem and in his final book from exile generally, Ovid gives the appearance of having learned significantly more about Pontic geography in the intervening six years from when he was first sent into exile (1–2: *haec mihi Cimmerio bis tertia ducitur aestas / litore* "this is my sixth summer on the Cimmerian shore"). Thus he adduces the names of some tribes from the Black Sea's eastern region, the Heniochi and the Achaei, as well as the name of a barbarian (Scythian?) leader, Piacches.[43] While these tribes posed little or—what's more likely—no actual threat to Ovid on the Pontus' western coast in Tomis, their names were

[42] In another poem Ovid equates the Ithacans' experience with the lotus to his own experience with poetry: both offer initial pleasure but ultimately bring harm, *Tr.* 4.1.31–32: *sic noua Dulichio lotos gustata palato / illo, quo nocuit, grata sapore fuit* "thus when the men of Ithaca tried the lotus, the savory taste was what also brought them harm."

[43] On Piacches, see Tomaschek 1894, 20; cf. *RE* I.204–205 "Achaioi" (Tomaschek); *RE* VIII.259–280 "Ἡνίοχοι" (Kiessling).

probably already known at Rome for piracy and, possibly, for cannibalism.[44] Thus it is fitting that the poet mentions here the Laestrygonians, Polyphemus, and Scylla—all man-eating monsters from Homer's *Odyssey*. Indeed, these strange and fierce-sounding peoples from the Black Sea are perhaps most striking for their resemblance to mythical figures of Homeric epic; for again they serve to counterbalance—and even outdo!—the monsters Ulysses himself meets in the *Odyssey*.[45] Moreover, the Cimmerian land of the poem's opening distich is the same shadowy place to which Ulysses traveled to speak to the souls in the underworld.[46] Ovid plays elsewhere upon Ulysses' voyage to the underworld (*Od.* 11), for example, when he likens his place of exile to the banks of the Styx, *Pont.*1.8.27: *careo uobis Stygias detrusus in oras* "you do I miss having been driven down to Stygian shores."[47] Ulysses' own words from his conversation with his mother in Hades, *Od.* 11.167: αἰὲν ἔχων ἀλάλημαι ὀϊζύν "I wander in eternal woe," are perhaps recalled in the poet's characterization of himself as *miser*, which of course is also a common sobriquet for the desperate lover in Roman elegy.[48] At any rate, it is worth mentioning that another interlocutor of Ulysses in the underworld, the unlucky and prematurely deceased Elpenor, actually receives the epithet *miser* from Ovid at *Tr.* 3.4a.19–20:

---

[44] The Heniochi and Achaei lay outside Roman control and lived by piracy according to Strabo 11.2.12–13; 17.3.24. They were also believed in antiquity to have practiced cannibalism, Arist. *Pol.* 8.3.4 (1338b): πολλὰ δ' ἔστι τῶν ἐθνῶν ἃ πρὸς τὸ κτείνειν καὶ πρὸς τὴν ἀνθρωποφαγίαν εὐχερῶς ἔχει, καθάπερ τῶν περὶ τὸν Πόντον 'Αχαιοί τε καὶ Ἡνίοχοι καὶ τῶν ἠπειρωτικῶν ἐθνῶν ἕτερα, τὰ μὲν ὁμοίως τούτοις τὰ δὲ μᾶλλον, ἃ λῃστρικὰ μέν ἐστιν, ἀνδρείας δ' οὐ μετειλήφασιν "There are many tribes with a proclivity for murder and cannibalism, such as those around the Black Sea—the Achaei and Heniochi—and other tribes of the mainland, some like the above, others worse, making their living from piracy and having no share in bravery."

[45] Cf. Podossinov 1987, 203: "[one may note] daß die von ihm gegebenen historischen Informationen im großen und ganzen wenig glaubhaft sind. Sie sind in erster Linie Bestandteile des Bildes, das er von dem 'barbarischen Land' im äußersten Norden in seinem Werk systematisch aufbaut."

[46] Cf. *Od.* 11.13–22. Ovid may be playing upon a gloss on Κιμέριοι recorded by Proteas Zeugmatites (*EM* 513.49), with χειμέριοι which becomes *hiberni* in Latin, hence wintery, an apt epithet for Ovid's place of exile.

[47] Similarly, *Tr.* 4.5.21–22: *et tutare caput nulli seruabile, si non / qui mersit Stygia subleuet illud aqua* "and protect a life to be saved by no one unless the one who sank it lifts it from the river Styx."

[48] On Ovid's use of the language of "Latin love-elegy" and the stock motif of the desperate lover in the exile poetry, see Harzer 1997, 66; Nagle 1980, 62; and above Ch. 1 n. 23.

> at miser Elpenor tecto delapsus ab alto
> occurrit regi debilis umbra suo.
>
> But wretched Elpenor fell from a high roof and as a deformed shade met his king.[49]

Such passages likening Tomis to the underworld in Ulysses' travels relate to the recurring theme of exile as equivalent to death;[50] more generally, they show the poet developing a rich intertext of allusions to the Homeric epics based on the amount of suffering common to both poems. The separation from home brought on by exile, for example, is presented in terms of the longing that Ulysses experiences at the outset of the *Odyssey*, 1.58: ['Οδυσσεύς] ἱέμενος καὶ καπνὸν ἀποθρῴσκοντα νοῆσαι "Odysseus longs to see the smoke rising too," which Ovid reproduces elegantly at *Pont.*1.3.33–34:[51]

> non dubia est Ithaci prudentia, sed tamen optat
> fumum de partiis posse uidere focis.
>
> The Ithacan's sagacity is beyond doubt, but he still wishes to be able to see smoke rising from his native hearth.

In *Tristia* 3.7, the beggar at Ulysses' palace in Ithaca, Irus, serves as the model of abject poverty in a reflection on fortune's rapidly turning face, 42: *Irus et est subito, qui modo Croesus erat* "And a beggar like Irus is made quickly out of him who was just a rich Croesus." Ovid's oft-repeated desire to have died before experiencing the ills of exile[52] recalls Ulysses' wish while cast out on the sea after leaving Calypso, *Od.* 5.308–312:

> ὡς δὴ ἐγώ γ' ὄφελον θανέειν καὶ πότμον ἐπισπεῖν
> ἤματι τῷ ὅτε μοι πλεῖστοι χαλκήρεα δοῦρα
> Τρῶες ἐπέρριψαν περὶ Πηλεΐωνι θανόντι
> τῶ κ' ἔλαχον κτερέων, καί μευ κλέος ἦγον 'Αχαιοί·
> νῦν δέ με λευγαλέῳ θανάτῳ εἵμαρτο ἁλῶναι.

[49] Cf. *Od.* 10.552–560. Later in the poem under discussion another figure from Homeric epic appears, Eumedes, the father of Dolon (*Il.* 10.314–315), who again represents abject suffering for having lost something dear to him, *Tr.* 3.4a.27–28: *Non foret Eumedes orbus, si filius eius / stultus Achilleos non adamasset equos* "Eumedes would not have lost his son if that one had not foolishly fallen in love with Achilles' horses."

[50] See above Intro. n. 44, and cf. Williams 2002a, 236; Claassen 1999, 239–241 with n. 37; Williams 1994, 12–13; Helzle 1988, 78; Nagle 1980, 23–35.

[51] Richmond 1990, ad loc.

[52] Cf. *Tr.* 3.3.33–34, after which the poet goes on to make the point (45–46) that he will die unmourned in a barbarian land without the honor of funerary rites or a tomb; 4.6.49–50; 5.6.19–20; *Pont.* 1.2.57–58: *saepe precor mortem, mortem quoque deprecor idem, /*

> Would that I had died and met with fate on that day when many Trojans rushed at me with their bronze lances for control of the body of the dead son of Peleus. For that I would have received a proper burial, and the Achaeans would have spread my fame. Now it has been fated for me to meet with a baneful death by drowning.

What is most crucial for Ulysses in this passage is his undying fame, κλέος, which is clearly one of the primary motivating forces behind Ovid's frequent allusions to Homer and his epics. Not surprisingly, Hector and the once great city of Troy give rise to an Ovidian maxim in exile with a notably proverbial ring to it that underscores the intimate connection of fame and suffering in literature, *Tr.* 4.3.75–76:

> Hectora quis nosset, si felix Troia fuisset?
> publica uirtutis per mala facta uia est.

> Who would know of Hector if Troy had been fortunate? The path to virtue is made through public suffering.[53]

The underlying point here is to exalt the power of poetry to confer fame on its subject. Yet now that Ovid has been exiled, the subject matter also appears to need suffering in order to make it worthy of song, as Helen's ἀοίδιμοι from the *Iliad* passage cited above. Indeed, the ability to endure suffering shapes the fundamental core of the analogy between Ovid and Ulysses. Thus Ovid links his poetic persona, *Naso*, to the Homeric hero (and, by extension, to the Vergilian Aeneas) by alluding to a famous motif in the *Odyssey* at *Pont.* 3.7.13–14:

> hoc quoque, Naso, feres: etenim peiora tulisti;
> iam tibi sentiri sarcina nulla potest.

> This too, Naso, you will bear: for worse have you borne; and you are no longer able to feel a burden of any kind.[54]

---

ne mea Sarmaticum contegat ossa solum "often I pray for death even as I beg it off lest Sarmatian soil cover my bones."

[53] Nisbet 1982, 55, takes *publica* with *uia*, and calls this a piece of Stoic doctrine, as in Sen. *Dial.* 1.4.6: *calamitas uirtutis occasio est* "disaster is an occasion for virtue," but see Luck 1977, ad loc.

[54] In particular, *Od.* 12.208–221 (cf. 10.174–177); 20.18: τέτλαθι δή, κραδίη· καὶ κύντερον ἄλλο ποτ' ἔτλης "take courage, heart: you've already endured something else even worse;" and Verg. *A.* 1.198–199: '*O socii (neque enim ignari sumus ante malorum) / o passi grauiora*' "O comrades, who've suffered worse: for we are quite familiar with ills from before!" Cf. *Tr.* 5.11.17: *perfer et obdura! multo grauiora tulisti* "Take it and endure! You've borne much worse than this."

Indeed, if Ulysses provides Ovid with a model against which to compare his individual hardships in exile, the *Iliad* furnishes more general suffering on a massive scale that involves a proverbially immeasurable number of ills, *Pont.* 2.7.33–34:

> quae [*sc. mala*] tibi si memori coner perscribere uersu,
> Ilias est fati longa futura mei
>
> If I tried to relate to you in verse all that I remember suffering, there would be a long *Iliad* of my misfortune.

This passage is typical of Ovid's identification with Homer and his epics in the exile poetry. It comes up casually, almost as a piece of fancy or whimsical reflection on the circumstances of his life in Tomis. Yet such whimsy is part of a larger, more general literary backdrop onto which the poet maps the details of his own experiences, whether real or imagined. Hence, the time-frame of the Trojan War serves as a measure of the duration of his ills in exile, *Tr.* 5.10.3–4:

> at mihi iam uideor patria procul esse tot annis,
> Dardana quot Graio Troia sub hoste fuit.
>
> But I feel as if I have been away from home for as many years as Troy lay under siege from the Greeks.[55]

In what follows (5–52), Ovid leaves open the possibility that the length of the Trojan War forms an inadequate measure for his immediate ills in exile. From what we know, the poet has only been in Tomis some three years at this point, and yet the analogy is hardly ill-conceived or unexpected. This is not simply because the poet is prone to exaggeration of this type (though of course he is, and this is in keeping with an understanding of Ovidian poetics as defined by an intrinsic excess or *copia*), but rather because Homer and his epics have been woven into the fabric of the exile poetry in the interest of putting Ovid's own suffering on view and laying claim to the immortalizing power for poetry to which the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* can testify most of all.

[55] For a similar sentiment involving a Homeric hero, cf. *Pont.* 1.4.9–10: *nam mea per longos si quis mala digerat annos, / crede mihi, Pylio Nestore maior ero* "for if anyone should tally my suffering over the long years—believe me—I'd be older than Pylian Nestor."

Ovid, Homer, and the ira principis

The Homeric epics also play an important role in Ovid's characterization of the *princeps* in relation to his own status in exile. In the third chapter of this study, I analyzed how Augustus is given a divine status in these poems and is often likened to Jupiter, the most pervasive mythological figure in the exile poetry. As the sole arbiter of Ovid's exile, he corresponds to Homer's Zeus, who is at once producer and protector of exiles in the *Iliad*. Of course, it bears repeating that these are very different poets working in very different poetic contexts and genres; nevertheless, a comparison of the cause and effect of exile in both is instructive. At *Il.* 24.527–533, for example, Achilles states in gnomic fashion that Zeus dispenses good and evil from two jars: to some he gives now of good, now of evil; whoever receives from the jar of woe alone, however, Zeus makes wretched and forces to wander about hungry, honored by neither gods nor mortals.[56] The hungry wanderer of Zeus' doing becomes a beggar, who carries the same thematic resonance of the figure of the exile on view in the tight correlation between Ovid and Ulysses—separation from home and great suffering. At least twice in the *Odyssey*, the beggar is also an exile, who lacks not only land (and food), but also regard among gods and men.[57] In keeping with his Homeric model, Ovid reiterates throughout his poems from exile that good fortune and fame previously attended him as the most celebrated poet in Rome.[58] A lack of divine providence and of popular esteem

[56] *Il.* 24.532–533: καί ἑ κακὴ βούβρωστις ἐπὶ χθόνα δῖαν ἐλαύνει, / φοιτᾷ δ' οὔτε θεοῖσιν τετιμένος οὔτε βροτοῖσιν. "And evil hunger drives him over the shining earth; he wanders, honored neither by gods nor by men." Cf. *Ib.* 107–112: *nec tibi Sol calidus nec sit tibi lucida Phoebe, / destituant oculos sidera clara tuos. / nec se Vulcanus nec se tibi praebeat aer, / nec tibi det tellus nec tibi pontus iter. / exul inops erres alienaque limina lustres, / exiguumque petas ore tremente cibum* "May the sun not be warm, nor the moon be bright for you; may your eyes miss the shining stars; may neither fire nor air be available to you, nor earth nor sea give you passage. May you wander as an exile in need around the homes of foreigners and beg for a bit of food with a tremulous voice."

[57] Most notably, Ulysses at his court (*Od.* 17–22); and also the seer, Theoclymenus, who begs Telemachus for passage from Pylos to Ithaca (*Od.* 15).

[58] E.g. *Tr.* 1.1.49–54, 4.1.3–4, 4.10.121–122: *tu* [Musa] *mihi, quod rarum est, uiuo sublime dedisti / nomen, ab exequiis quod dare fama solet* "You, Muse, gave me while I was alive the rarity of a lofty name, which fame is wont to grant after death;" 5.1.75–76. Note, however, the familiar strain found in Seneca and subsequent (Stoic) writers that exile is indeed no evil, Sen. *Dial.* 12.6.1–2: *Remoto ergo iudicio plurium … uideamus quid sit exilium. Nempe loci commutatio* "Once then the judgment of the many has been set aside … we may observe what exile actually is: nothing but a change of place;" *ibid.* 12.8.2–6; and

along with the loss of the home in his native land define the exile in both Homer and the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto*. If Zeus and the gods of Homer prefigure any cosmic notion of "divine justice," they nevertheless remain beholden to fate, μοῖρα.[59] Ovid's divine structure, on the other hand, knows only the willful exercise of *ius*, made subject to the anger of the emperor, *ira principis*. In the exile poetry, it seems, Homeric μοῖρα has been replaced by imperial μῆνις.[60]

The emperor's wrath has been called by one critic "the central theme which runs throughout the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto*."[61] Wrath, or μῆνις, was of course the opening word and driving force behind the *Iliad* and was apparently known in antiquity to apply only to the gods and Achilles.[62] In addition, Ulysses' name—in Greek 'Οδυσσεύς—was derived from the verb ὀδύσασθαι, which in the sense "to cause pain" fits neatly into the identification made above with Ulysses as the paradigmatic sufferer in Greek myth.[63] At the same time, this verb

---

cf. Plut. *de exilio* 15 (605 d): διὸ καὶ γελοῖός ἐστιν ὁ νομίζων ἀδοξίαν τῇ φυγῇ προσεῖναι "For this reason, whoever thinks that loss of fame accompanies exile is a fool."

[59] *Od.* 14.83–84: οὐ μὲν σχέτλια ἔργα θεοὶ μάκαρες φιλέουσιν, / ἀλλὰ δίκην τίουσι καὶ αἴσιμα ἔργ' ἀνθρώπων· "The blessed gods do not love impious deeds, but honor justice and the righteous deeds of men," may be an exception, see Heubeck-Hoekstra 1989, 198 ad loc. Cf. Russo 1992, 66 (ad *Od.* 18.275): "the meaning 'justice' [for δίκη] and its expansion into an abstract or cosmic principle or personification is developed first in Hesiod, later in Pindar, Aeschylus and the pre-Socratics." Nevertheless, Zeus' remarks on the fate of Aegisthus from the opening of the *Odyssey* (1.32–43) seem to suggest at least a general concern with justice. Note too from the simile at *Il.* 16.386–388: Ζεύς, ὅτε δή ῥ' ἄνδρεσσι κοτεσσάμενος χαλεπήνῃ / οἳ βίῃ εἰν ἀγορῇ σκολιὰς κρίνωσι θέμιστας / ἐκ δὲ δίκην ἐλάσωσι, θεῶν ὄπιν οὐκ ἀλέγοντες "When Zeus makes trouble for men, having grown angry at those who with violence in court pronounce crooked judgments and drive out justice, putting no stock in the gaze of the gods." See Janko 1992, 366 ad loc., on the meaning of δίκη as "legal process" or "case" and the idea of punishment embedded in the phrase θεῶν ὄπις.

[60] Fitton Brown 1985, 22, has already noticed, "there is the paradox of Augustus, who was justly offended but whose god-like μῆνις went beyond all reason."

[61] Scott 1930, 57.

[62] According to the Homeric scholia ad *Il.* 1.1 (Erbse 1969 ad loc.), of all the terms for anger in the *Iliad*—ὀργή, θυμός, χόλος, κότος—μῆνις is the most severe, thus most appropriate for Achilles and the gods.

[63] Dimcock 1991 (orig. 1965), "The Name of Odysseus," is fundamental and can be brought to bear on the arguments regarding Ulysses as the paradigmatic sufferer, esp. 117: "In exposing Odysseus to Poseidon, in allowing him to do and to suffer, Zeus is odysseusing Odysseus, giving him his identity. In accepting the implications of his name, Trouble, Odysseus establishes his identity in harmony with the nature of things."

can also mean "to be wrathful," especially when it is used of gods.[64] In the light of this curious convergence, Jenny Strauss Clay has noted of Homer's epics that "the *menis* of Achilles and the name of Ulysses both point to the fact that wrath forms the crucial arena of both poems. Wrath in a sense defines the liminal area between gods and men."[65] Similarly, the motivating force behind the Ovidian poetics of exile is perhaps most readily found in the recurring adonean *Caesaris ira* "the wrath of Caesar."[66] Ronald Syme called Ovid's frequent use of *ira* in the exile poetry the most important "line of attack" against the *princeps*.[67] There, the term *ira* is most often joined with *Caesar*, *princeps, deus, numen*, or *Iuppiter* and nearly always refers to Augustus.[68] In fact, by my own account, only five of the seventy-eight uses of *ira* in the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* do *not* refer directly or indirectly to the anger of the *princeps*.[69] It should come as no surprise, then, given what has been said thus far about the poet's identification with both Homer and Ulysses and the preponderance of Iliadic and Odyssean reminiscences

64 Clay 1983, 65 n. 24 with bibliography.

65 Clay 1983, 68; cf. Watkins 1977, 190: "c'est dans les rapports réciproques des dieux et des hommes qu'il faut rechercher la sémantique de μῆνις."

66 This applies also to the other permutations of the adonean, *principis ira / numinis ira*, as well as to the non-adonean constructions *ira Iouis / ira dei*, see Scott 1930, 57–58; Claassen 1987, 34; and Gaertner 2005, ad *Pont.* 1.4.29: "The reference to the *Caesaris ira* implicitly criticizes the emperor, as anger was commonly viewed as inappropriate for a ruler; furthermore, it fuses an autobiographical detail (Ovid's banishment) and a historical fact (the various degrees of emperor worship) with the literary topos of divine anger."

67 Syme 1978, 223, and see 224: "a 'princeps' should not give way to anger, neither should a Caesar … at the lowest, the comportment of this Caesar is shown discrepant with the dignity of his station." Cf. Drucker 1977, 172, for whom *ira* is Augustus' "hervorstechendster Zug."

68 Cf. Scott 1930, 57–58: "[Ira] is represented as being the wrath of the god (*dei*), of the princeps (*principis*), of the divinity (*numinis*), of Caesar (*Caesaris*), or sometimes of Jupiter (*Iouis*), and it is clear that these words are used quite indifferently," with n. 57 for some examples.

69 Three of those five occur in *ex Ponto* Book 4 (3.21; 14.16, 41), which may mean *after* the death of Augustus, although this must remain pure speculation. Another, in *Tr.* 2.525: *utque sedet uultu fassus Telamonius iram* "as Ajax sits with a look that has betrayed his anger," may contain a veiled reference to Augustus' attempt at a tragedy on Ajax that we learn of from Suet. *Aug.*85 and to Ovid's lost tragedy on Medea, the subject of the couplet's pentameter, 526: *inque oculis facinus barbara mater habet* "and the barbarian mother with murder in her eyes." Finally, the *ira maris* in *Tr.* 1.2.108 refers to the natural force of the sea that is ultimately overcome by the power of the divine Augustus. In *Ib.* the situation is different because *ira* defines the personal animosity Ovid feels towards the object of his invective, as at 86, 139, 413. Otherwise it is used of Polynices and Eteocles (36) and the wrath of Venus towards Hippolytus (577).

throughout the exile poetry, that Ovid has construed his relation to the *princeps* in Homeric terms: the *ira* of Augustus is akin to the μῆνις of Achilles, the anger of the gods transposed upon a mortal.[70] Indeed, Augustus is of necessity identified with Achilles when Ovid presents himself as a Telephus-figure to remind the emperor that only he who inflicted the wound (of exile) can heal it.[71] The identification of the *princeps* with Achilles relates to a problem I have already treated in the third chapter: Augustus has a status unique in the exile poetry as both the most exceptional man (*princeps*) and the most powerful god (e.g. *maximus diuus*, *Tr.* 3.1.78).[72] Given what we have said about Ovid's consistent identification of himself with the figure of Ulysses, it may be worth considering in the light of Augustus' association with Achilles that Ulysses speaks with Achilles in the underworld (*Od.* 11) and knows, first, his feelings on death and life and, second, that he is not a god.

Ovid's identification of himself and Augustus with the famous (Euripidean) tragic duo of Telephus and Achilles relates more generally to his practice of introducing pairs of figures from myth to adumbrate the major themes in his exile poetry. For example, Orestes and Pylades or, nearly as often, Theseus and Pirithous represent ideal companions when Ovid writes to his friends (or enemies) back in Rome on the importance of being loyal in friendship.[73] For the poet's characterization

[70] As the Homeric scholiasts point out ad *Il.* 1.1 (Erbse 1969 ad loc.), Homer uses other terms to describe Achilles' anger (e.g. *Il.* 1.181: κοτέω; 1.192: χόλος). Yet the prevalent association of μῆνις with divine anger adds another level to Achilles' status in the poem, an intermediary status between god and man, which in turn may have suggested to Ovid the analogy between Augustus and Achilles.

[71] For the Ovid-Telephus / Augustus-Achilles theme see *Tr.* 1.1.100, 2.19–20, 5.2.15, *Pont.* 1.7.51, 2.2.26. In *Tr.* 3.5.37–38, Augustus is again likened to Achilles, this time for the mercy he showed to Priam, and again in *Tr.* 5.1.55–56. Cf. *Tr.* 3.4, on Hector (Ovid)—Andromache (Ovid's wife)—Achilles (Augustus). Cf. Ehlers 1988, 156, for whom the poems from exile construct a *Schicksalstragödie*, which consistently offers the poet the opportunity for identification with a tragic hero. Thus Ovid likens himself to Achilles who wiled away his cares by playing on the lyre, *Tr.* 4.1.15–16: *fertur et abducta Lyrneside tristis Achilles / Haemonia curas attenuasse lyra* "Achilles in grief over the abduction of Briseis is said to have lessened his worry on the Thessalian lyre."

[72] Cf. *Pont.* 1.2.71: *nescit enim* Caesar, *quamuis* deus *omnia norit*... "for *Caesar* does not know, though a *god* knows all ..." 87–88: *ira* uiri *mitis non me misisset in istam, / si satis haec illi nota fuisset humus* "the mild *man*'s anger would not have sent me to this land if it had been somewhat familiar to him."

[73] For Orestes and Pylades see *Tr.* 1.5.21–22, 1.9.27–28, 5.4.25–26, 5.6.25–26, *Pont.* 2.3.45–46, 3.2 passim; and for Theseus and Pirithous *Tr.* 1.5.19–20, 1.9.31–32, *Pont.* 2.3.43–44, 3.2.33, 4.10.71–72; other pairs of friends are Achilles and Patroclus *Tr.* 1.9.29–30; 5.4.25–26; *Pont.* 2.3.41–42, and Nisus and Euryalus *Tr.* 1.5.23–24, 1.9.33–34.

of his relationship with an emperor whose wrath exceeded all measure, the legendary pair of Perillus and Phalaris, whose story had achieved quasi-mythical status at Rome in Ovid's day, come to represent the persecuted artist and the evil tyrant.[74]

For illustrating the unbounded wrath of the gods and the excessive punishment they are prone to exact, however, the figure of Actaeon offers the most suggestive mythical parallel.[75] Though he appears only once (*Tr.* 2.105–106), the circumstances of his misdeed and its subsequent punishment vividly recall certain features of Ovid's own predicament.[76] The hunter Actaeon was turned into a stag by Diana and then torn apart by his own dogs for having inadvertently caught sight of the goddess while she bathed. In several instances in the exile poetry Ovid suggests that part of his crime also involved seeing something which he should not have.[77] In both cases, a god was involved and the act of observing was at once unintentional and unavoidable. And like Ovid's crime in exile, Actaeon's crime in the *Metamorphoses* is described as an *error* and not a *scelus*.[78]

The similarity in the language Ovid uses to describe the Actaeon episode in both places led Max Pohlenz in 1913 to posit that the Actaeon passage from the *Metamorphoses* was refashioned after Ovid was banished in order to fit the circumstances of his exile.[79] Pohlenz may be right, but a cogent argument can be built for the opposing case:

[74] The story of Perillus and Phalaris appears at *Tr.* 5.1.53–54, 3.11.51–52, 5.1.53–54; *Pont.* 2.9.43–44, 3.6.41–42. It is also known elsewhere, e.g. Cic. *Ver.* 4.73; *Att.* 7.20.2; Prop. 2.25.12; and receives a lengthy treatment in Ovid's own *Ars* 1.647–658.

[75] Rosiello 2002, 446–452.

[76] Luck 1977 on *Tr.* 2.108: "Ovid sieht im Helden des Mythos [Actaeon] ein Gegenbild zu sich selbst, so wie anderswo (*Tr.* 1.5.57ff.) in Odysseus." Note that the next figure to appear in this catalogue is Daedalus as he longs for home. Daedalus' appearance supplies another instance of a creative artist brought low by his own art, which caused the death of Icarus.

[77] *Tr.* 2.103; 3.5.49–50, and 3.6.28. Goold 1983, 100, gives no credence to Ovid's claim that he saw something, but cf. Owen 1924, 142: "Since Ovid's offence concerned a member of the 'divine' Imperial House, the illustration is effective."

[78] *Met.* 3.141–142: *at bene si quaeras, Fortunae crimen in illo / non scelus inuenies; quod enim scelus error habebat*? "But if you should look closely, you will find the fault of fate in it, no crime. For what crime was there in a mistake?" 175: *non certis passibus errans* "wandering on unsure steps." See Pohlenz 1913, 10–11: "[it is noteworthy] dass Ovid zur Charakterisierung von Actaeons Schuldlosigkeit genau dieselben Worte wählt, die er in der Verbannung ständig von sich gebraucht." Cf. Rosiello 2002, 452.

[79] Pohlenz 1913, 11: "Ovid hat III 141–142 erst nach der Verbannung eingefügt, weil ihn sein eigenes Vergehen an Actaeon erinnert hatte." On the so-called "exilic recension" of the *Met.*, see above Intro. n. 19 and Ch. 5 n. 15.

while in exile Ovid recalled this passage from the *Metamorphoses* and was thus reminded of the possibilities that the Actaeon story offered for interpreting his own immediate experience with an innocent mistake and excessive punishment. Whichever way we choose to read the two passages, there can be little doubt that the Actaeon story provides the exiled Ovid with a mythical paradigm with which to reconstruct the circumstances of his banishment. Indeed, what Pohlenz has taken note of here points to an essential element in the poetics of exile: Ovid uses the stories found in myth—such as those of Actaeon, Telephus, and Ulysses—in order to portray his own personal suffering in Tomis. Myth becomes a mode of understanding and recognition on the basis of which the poet is able to convey the nature of his predicament as—to wit—mild, severe, just, unjust, necessary, or ineluctable.

For the case at hand, it is important to recognize that both Actaeon and Ovid commit an *error* (as opposed to *scelus, facinus, nefas* vel sim.). Of course, the metamorphosis into a deer leaves Actaeon without the ability to speak and leads directly to his cruel death (*Met.* 3.192–193; 230–231). Ovid can obviously still speak but chooses to keep silent because he does not wish to reopen the emperor's wounds, as he says in his open appeal to Augustus, *Tr.* 2.208–210. Earlier in that poem, the poet mentions the figure of Actaeon at the very point at which he discusses his own *error*, *Tr.* 2.103–110:

> cur aliquid uidi? cur noxia lumina feci?
> cur imprudenti cognita culpa mihi?
> inscius Actaeon uidit sine ueste Dianam:
> praeda fuit canibus non minus ille suis.
> scilicet in superis etiam fortuna luenda est,
> nec ueniam laeso numine casus habet.
> illa nostra die, qua me malus abstulit error,
> parua quidem periit, sed sine labe domus.

> Why did I see something? Why did I make my eyes the source of my guilt? Why in my folly did I come to know a fault? Inadvertently did Actaeon catch sight of Diana without clothes, nevertheless he became the prey of his own dogs. Of course, in the affairs of the gods even bad luck has to be atoned for, and a matter of chance wins no indulgence from the divinity that was wronged. That day on which a grave error whisked me away also witnessed the ruin of our home, which—albeit modest—was without stain.

The emphasis in the passage is on the term *inscius*: both the poet and the mythical hunter are unwitting players in an affair that lies outside their immediate awareness and, ultimately, beyond their ability

to resolve it.[80] The analogy between Actaeon and Ovid early on in *Tristia* 2 and in the exile poetry in general underscores the arbitrary nature and unwarranted excess of the punishment that Augustus chose for the poet. There are of course seven more books to follow, and the reader has only just begun to glean how the poet reconstructs his exile with the forms of representation afforded by the Greek and Latin literary tradition. Unlike Actaeon, however, Ovid is not doomed to silence but gives voice to unfailing laments for his wretched condition in life. He not only lives his exile, he even recreates it in verse to become both the subject and the author of his own doom, at once a mythical construct and creative artist.

Ars, Ingenium, *and the Representation of Lived Experience*

Before concluding my analysis of Ovid's self-representation in exile and his status as the author of an exile that he also must endure, I would like to return briefly to the figures of Homer and Ulysses. I have argued here that Ovid unites these figures into his own exilic persona, *Naso uates et exul*, for two main reasons: first, because of the proverbial amount of suffering that tradition had attached to Homer's epics and to Ulysses' mythical wanderings; and second, because of the prominent position both held in the literary tradition of Greece and Rome. Yet there is also something of the wily hero about Ovid in exile that makes his identification with Ulysses especially apt for the representation of his predicament there. The way in which he presents his dealings with the *princeps*, for example, may be described as circumspect: he is never overt in his condemnation of the emperor, only suggestive of mistreatment at his hands. Homer's resourceful hero is nearly always circumspect in his representation of himself to others, and his steadfast reliance on μῆτις, or cunning intelligence, ultimately allows him to overcome his separation from home. In fact, cunning and trickery may contribute more to Ulysses' fame in Homer than his suffering. Thus, at the court of Alcinous in Phaeacia, he states, *Od.* 9.19–20:

[80] This point is made elegantly by Hinds 1985, 20, about Ovid's reference in *Tr.* 1.1.114 to Oedipus and Telegonus, who unwittingly killed their fathers, just as his own books of the *Ars*, "[which] destroyed him; but they did so as a result of circumstances beyond their control."

> εἴμ' Ὀδυσεὺς Λαερτιάδης, ὃς πᾶσι δόλοισιν
> ἀνθρώποισι μέλω, καί μευ κλέος οὐρανὸν ἵκει.
>
> I am Odysseus, son of Laertes, who by all manners of wiles am in men's thoughts, and my fame reaches heaven.[81]

For Homer's Ulysses, poetic fame, κλέος, is a matter not just of suffering but also—and perhaps primarily—of cunning intelligence.[82] Ovid's identification in the exile poetry with Ulysses depends in part on the understanding that he too is endowed with a degree of cunning intelligence or what might be readily identified here with his *ingenium*, natural capacity or genius.[83] In contrast to the cunning intelligence of Ulysses, his own *ingenium* will never bring him home, though it will probably help to ensure his fame in the future, as the words on the epitaph he composes for himself imply, *Tr.* 3.3.73–74:

> hic ego qui iaceo tenerorum lusor Amorum
> ingenio perii Naso poeta meo.
>
> Here I lie, who have come to ruin by my own poetic genius, Naso, the frivolous poet of tender *Loves*.

At the same time, Ovid's emphasis on his natural talent (*ingenium*)—and the affinity he shares with Ulysses because of it—does not neglect his acquired skill (*ars*).[84] As the Greco-Roman poetic tradition dictated, *ingenium* and *ars* form the two most crucial elements in the composition of Ovidian verse, and the poet himself appears to reveal as much in his famous characterization of Ennius, *Tr.* 2.424: *Ennius ingenio maximus, arte*

[81] Cf. *Il.* 3.200–202: οὗτος δ' αὖ Λαερτιάδης πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς, / ὃς τράφη ἐν δήμῳ Ἰθάκης κραναῆς περ ἐούσης / εἰδὼς παντοίους τε δόλους καὶ μήδεα πυκνά. "This again is Laërtes' son, the wily Odysseus, who was raised among the people of Ithaca, rugged though it is, and who knows all kinds of tricks and cunning plans."

[82] Horace calls him *dolosus* "tricky" in *Serm.* 2.5.3, and in *Met.* 13, Ulysses is remembered by Ajax for his utter lack of scruples, in particular for having invented a crime (59–60: *fictum … crimen*) to bring about death for Palamedes as revenge for having forced Ulysses to go to Troy in the first place.

[83] The more common Latin words for μῆτις are *astutia*, *uersutia*, or *calliditas*, only the last of which appears once in the adjectival form *callidus*, *Tr.* 2.500, and does not refer to Ovid. Of course, *ingenium* (viz. *ingeniosus*) is one of the more prominent words in the exile poetry—and generally in the work of Ovid, *nimium amator ingenii sui* "a poet excessively fond of his own genius" (Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.88)—and is readily associated with Ovid's own poetic genius, see above Ch. 5 139–140.

[84] On the way in which the poetic act helps him forget the misery of exile, cf. *Tr.* 5.7.65–68, discussed above 148, and *Pont.* 1.5.54–55: *cum bene quaesieris quid agam, magis utile nil est / artibus his quae nil utilitatis habent. / consequor ex illis casus obliuia nostri* "when you have pondered well what I am to do, nothing is more useful than these arts that have no use. From them I attain oblivion from my misfortune."

rudis "Ennius, as full of talent as possible, but devoid of skill."[85] Later in his poems from exile, he again brings together *ingenium* and *ars* in a letter addressed to Germanicus' teacher Salanus on the commonality of the arts of rhetoric and poetry, *Pont.* 2.5.63–66:

> tu quoque Pieridum studio, studiose, teneris
> ingenioque faues, ingeniose, meo.
> distat opus nostrum, sed fontibus exit ab isdem
> artis et ingenuae cultor uterque sumus.

> You too are held by the pursuit of the Muses, studious one, and you favor my poetic talent, talented one; our professions are different but spring from the same fonts, and we are both cultivators of a refined art.

Of course, in Ovid's case both *ars* and *ingenium* have been made to suffer in exile, *Tr.* 5.1.27: *non haec ingenio, non haec componimus arte* "I write these poems with no talent, with no skill."[86] The suffering induced by exile, the poet professes, has caused his poetry to deteriorate, a motif repeated continuously from the first book of the *Tristia*, 1.11.35–36:

> quo magis his debes ignoscere, candide lector,
> si spe sint, ut sunt, inferiora tua.

> All the more ought you to indulge these poems, good reader, if they prove to be—as they are—worse than what you expected;

to the last *ex Ponto*, 4.13.17–18:

> nec te mirari si sint uitiosa decebit
> carmina, quae faciam paene poeta Getes.

> And it will not be right for you to wonder if the poems I write are full of mistakes, being myself now practically a Getic poet.[87]

---

[85] Cf. Luck 1977, ad loc., on the "Gegensatz von φύσις (εὐφυία) und τέχνη (ἄσκησις)." Note that the converse is true of Ovid's assessment of Callimachus in *Am.* 1.15.14: *quamuis ingenio non ualet, arte ualet* "what he lacks in talent, he makes up for in skill," on which see McKeown 1989, ad loc., for a brief discussion of the problem in Ovid, and more generally Brink 1971, 394–400 (ad Hor. *Ars* 408–418), on "Genius and artistry in literary theory."

[86] The poem continues, *Tr.* 5.1.28–30: *materia est propriis ingeniosa malis. / et quota fortunae pars est in carmine nostrae? / felix, qui patitur quae numerare potest!* "the subject is inspired by its own suffering. And how small a part of my lot in my poetry? Happy he who can count his suffering!" Cf. also *Tr.* 3.14.33–34: *ingenium fregere meum mala, cuius et ante / fons infecundus paruaque uena fuit* "My suffering has broken my talent, which even before came from a barren source and tiny trickle;" 5.12.21–22: *adde quod ingenium longa rubigine laesum / torpet et est multo, quam fuit ante, minus* "in addition, my talent is sluggish, injured by long neglect, and much less than it was before."

[87] And often in between, *Tr.* 1.1.35–50; 1.7.35–40; 3.1.17–18; 3.14.25–26; 4.1.1–2; *Pont.* 3.9.19–20.

Although such claims are belied by the learning and polish of the poems themselves, Ovid nevertheless insists that his poetry has deteriorated along with his situation in life.[88] The disjunction between what the poet says (my poetry is a failure) and what his artistry can be shown to achieve (*Tr.* and *Pont.* continue to entertain and instruct) is intrinsic to Ovidian poetics in exile.[89] Above all, it helps to convey the impression that the distance between actual experience (*relegatio*) and poetic representation (*carmina*) has collapsed. For the banished poet, there is no longer any distinction between life (*uita*) and art (*ars*), the one is fully representative of the other and *vice versa*, *Tr.* 5.1.3–4:

> hic [*sc. libellus*] quoque talis erit, qualis fortuna poetae:
> inuenies toto carmine dulce nihil.

> This book too will be like to the fate of its author: you will find no sweetness in the entire poem.[90]

Thus, if his life is miserable, so too must his poems be poor in quality, *Tr.* 5.1.69: '*at mala sunt*'. *fateor* "'but they're bad poems', I admit."

Yet not to write for Ovid is inconceivable; for without poetry life in Tomis would be insufferable.[91] He thus continues to compose poems in exile in order to survive, *Pont.* 1.5.44: *mors nobis tempus habetur iners* "time without art I consider death." By continuing to write, by employing *ars* and *ingenium* and constantly reaffirming through poetry what has happened in life, Ovid creates a mode of surviving exile and an otherwise unbearable existence in a foreign place. This reading takes on added significance when we recall that Ovid often represents his place of exile as a kind of death, which itself serves as a fitting metaphor for the poet's

---

[88] See Williams 1994, 50–99; Nagle 1980, 109–120, on "deterioration" as a poetic motif, and above Intro. 14 with n. 50; Ch. 5 n. 60.

[89] Here is not the place for a discussion of the purpose of poetry in antiquity, but Horace's pithy definition from *Ars Poetica* is probably a good place to start, 333–334: *aut prodesse uolunt aut delectare poetae / aut simul et iucunda et idonea dicere uitae* "poets wish either to be useful or to delight or to say at once what's both pleasing and apt for living." Cf. Brink 1971, 325–328 (ad 295ff.).

[90] Cf. *Tr.* 5.7.60: *non hominis culpa, sed ista loci* "that's not the fault of the man, but of the place;" 5.12.36: [carmina] *digna sui domini tempore, digna loco* "the poetry is worthy of both its author's condition and his place;" and cf. *Tr.* 3.14.51–52; 4.1.1–2.

[91] *Tr.* 2.1–14; 4.1.35–39; 4.10.117–118: *gratia, Musa, tibi: nam tu solacia praebes, / tu curae requies, tu medicina uenis* "thank you, Muse: you offer solace and come as a source of respite and cure for my anxiety;" and 5.1.33–34; *Pont.* 4.2.39–40: *sed quid solus agam, quaque infelicia perdam / otia materia surripiamque diem*? "but what shall I do alone? with what activity shall I pass my unhappy leisure and trick the day?"

physical displacement from Rome. Again, it is difficult to miss the irony here: Ovid has to "die" in verse in order to survive in exile.

If the poetic act, as realized through the just combination of applied technique (*ars*) and natural talent (*ingenium*), provides the poet with the means to overcome physical hardship and even to forestall death while in exile, it also sets him on the path to achieve immortality through literature. In terms of the distinction drawn at the outset of this chapter between Homer as poet and author and Ulysses as exile and subject, the former represents *ars* (τέχνη), the latter *ingenium* (μῆτις).[92] Such a distinction may again be overly neat, and both figures were no doubt frequently connected with one or even both of these terms.[93] Yet that the exiled Ovid chooses to identify himself consistently with the consummate practitioner of the poetic art in antiquity and that poet's most intelligent creation is no doubt significant for gauging the scope of his exilic œuvre. On the surface, these poems purport to be private and ill-formed reflections on the evils of exile. At the same time, they make public the claim to contain and even to outdo the sum of suffering that was connected in antiquity with Homer and Ulysses. The figures of Homer and Ulysses bestow upon the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* a universal and universalizing character, one that transcends the immediate sequence of historical circumstances and lays claim to an immortality guaranteed by the foremost authorities on suffering and fame within the literary tradition of Greece and Rome.

---

[92] Consider Stanford 1963, 138: "Ovid was particularly well endowed by nature and art to appreciate Ulysses' personality." Stanford's point may be illustrated in the poet's representation of Ulysses' speech at *Met.* 13.123–398, and also helps to explain why Ovid is so keen to identify with Ulysses in *Tr.* and *Pont.*

[93] E.g. *Tr.* 1.1.47–48: *da mihi Maeoniden et tot circumice casus / ingenium tantis excidet omne malis* "Let's take Homer, for example, and throw as many misfortunes about him; all his genius will fall away amid such great suffering;" *Met.* 13.323: *aliqua perducet callidus arte* "skilled in some form of artistry he will persuade his listener," used by Ulysses ironically of Ajax, but actually to refer to his own "skill in trickery."

CONCLUSION

THE EXILE'S LAST WORD: POWER AND POETIC REDRESS ON THE MARGINS OF EMPIRE

fleque meos casus: est quaedam flere uoluptas;
expletur lacrimis egeriturque dolor

And weep for my troubles: there's a certain pleasure in weeping; grief is sated and worked out by tears.

Tr. 4.3.37–38

Thus far I have presented arguments to show that in the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* Ovid lays claim to the immortalizing power of poetry over against the exiling power of the *princeps*. My analysis of the terms *fas, ius*, *lex*, and *uates* in the fifth chapter, for example, shows that, while Augustus controls the legal right to ban citizens from Rome (*ius*-*lex*), Ovid still maintains the ability to speak in accordance with a divine right (*fas*) granted to poets and, especially, to *uates*. In the immediate sequel, the poet is grossly overmatched and easily outdone, and the mere fact of his exile testifies to the very real power of a legal control that ultimately depends on the exercise of brute force. But poetic power in Ovid's day was measured in terms of posterity, that is, in terms of general readers and future writers to come after the poet and the *princeps*. The power of Augustus, Tiberius, and emperors to follow, by contrast, resides in the mutual understanding between Rome's "first citizen" (*princeps*) and the rest of the empire that the emperor retains the right to condemn to death.[1] Inevitably, this power is bounded by time and ends with the end of his rule; it is thus offset by the basic premise under which Ovid and virtually all ancient poets operate. The convention among the ancients holds that the poetic act

[1] Cf. *Pont.* 4.5.31–32: '*uiuit adhuc, uitamque tibi debere fatetur, / quam prius a miti Caesare munus habet*,' "'he's still alive and admits to owe you his life, which he holds first as a gift from a clement Caesar'." Ovid hopes his addressee, Sextus Pompeius, will speak these words to Germanicus on his behalf; cf. *Tr.* 1.2.61–64; 2.129–130; 4.4.45–46; 5.2.55: *ira quidem moderata tua*, [Caesar], *uitamque dedisti* "your anger, Caesar, has been moderate, and you have allowed me to live;" 5.4.21–22; 5.9.13; *Pont.* 4.15.3–4.

transcends time and can rightfully lay claim to an immortality not bestowed on physical objects or, for that matter, on political power.[2] In Ovid's particular case, the art of poetry provides the exile with the power to speak after death and always gives him the last word.

This word is of course the sum of words contained in his poems, which made Ovid's predicament in exile knowable to all in Augustan Rome and which continue to be read today. Having the final say will never give the poet victory; for there was never any actual contest or prize to be won. Instead, Ovid's exilic voice simply abides, and its abiding presence serves to balance out the inexorable force of history that had him physically banned from Rome. Herein lies the most compelling link between the exile poetry and what Seamus Heaney has called "the redress of poetry." For Heaney, the practice of poetry under the kind of conditions Ovid writes about in exile is fundamentally tied to "the idea of counterweighting, of balancing out the forces, of redress—tilting the scales of reality towards some transcendent equilibrium."[3] Heaney's notion of poetic redress has informed the present study from the start because it contains the implicit recognition that Ovid's frequent appeals to the immortality of verse are not merely perfunctory nods to poetic convention.[4] Rather, they make up an essential part of a pointed and enduring response to the poet's immediate circumstances in exile.

As carefully constructed responses from a particular place and time, these poems also address specific historical changes brought about by the *princeps*—for example, to Roman legal procedure (Ch. 2), poetic convention (Ch. 3), and religious ritual throughout the empire (Ch. 4)—that helped to make the poet's banishment possible at all. There is no ambiguity in the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* about who determined Ovid's exile and in whose hands the matter of a reprieve rested: Augustus was both the primary cause of what he alone could solve. By linking the emperor so closely to the reasons behind his exile, Ovid attempts to offset the oppressive burden of the historical situation and create, as

[2] On this convention in Greek and Latin poetry, see above Ch. 4 n. 61; in Ovid's exile poetry, see Ch. 6. nn. 34–35; and for Ovid's treatment before the exile poetry, cf. Ov. *Am.* 1.15, on which see McKeown 1989, 387–389; *Met.* 15.871–879, with Bömer 1986, ad loc.

[3] Heaney 1995, 3.

[4] *Tr.* 1.6.35–36; 3.3.77–78; 3.4a.45–46; 3.7.49–54; 4.9.19–26; 4.10.2, 127–132; 5.14.5–6, 33–42; *Pont.* 2.6.33–34; 3.2.29–30; 4.7.53–54.

Heaney would have it, a redressive "counter-reality" in verse.[5] How this process of poetic redress takes place and what it ultimately requires of the poet is explained by Heaney later in his opening lecture as Professor of Poetry at Oxford, "The Redress of Poetry" (1995, 4):

> The redressing effect of poetry comes from its being a glimpsed alternative, a revelation of potential that is denied or constantly threatened by circumstances. And sometimes, of course, it happens that such a revelation, once enshrined in the poem, remains as a standard for the poet, so that he or she must then submit to the strain of bearing witness in his or her own life to the plane of consciousness established in the poem.

Ovid's "revelation" is the recognition, whether "glimpsed" or gradual, that his individual circumstances as a poet in Rome at the end of the Augustan era are not necessarily particular to himself; that exile (and its alternative, death) is a potential that also threatens his contemporaries and, for that matter, all poets practicing their art under the threat of political persecution.[6] This helps to explain why he is keen in exile to liken himself to Homer: the paradigmatic poet of classical antiquity bestows authority on his poetic undertaking and serves to universalize his personal experience in Tomis (Ch. 6). There, Ovid enshrines the imminent threat cast over poetry at Rome—this is his *revelation*—by becoming in verse what Augustus has forced him to become in life. His life is exile, banishment to the outer reaches of the empire; his art is sad, unfailing elegiac laments for his now marginalized status as a Roman poet in Tomis—this is the *plane of consciousness* established in these poems. In bearing witness to his own wretched status in exile, to the questionable legality and evident excess of his punishment, and to the aura of state-sanctioned divinity about the emperor and his family, Ovid also enshrines in the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* a picture of the *princeps* as an irrational autocrat whose anger knew no bounds.

---

[5] Heaney 1995, 3–4: "[In] the activity of poetry ... there is a tendency to place a counter-reality in the scales—a reality which may be only imagined but which nevertheless has weight because it is imagined with the gravitational pull of the actual and can therefore hold its own and balance out against the historical situation."

[6] This may contribute to why in *Tr.* 2.421–546 he compares himself repeatedly with other Roman poets, past and present, e.g., 495–496: *nempe* (*nec inuideo*) *tot de scribentibus unus, / quam sua perdiderit Musa, repertus ego* "From so many writers—and I'm not envious—I alone am found to have been destroyed by his Muse." Perhaps also germane here is the very last poem of the exilic collection, *Pont.* 4.16, in which Ovid offers a lengthy catalogue of active poets, some of them mere names to us now, e.g. Lupus (26) and Rufus (28); cf. Helzle 1989, 189.

In fact, the poet is explicit about the boundlessness of Augustus' anger, which he portrays as ranging from east to west over the whole world, *Pont.* 1.4.29–30:

> Caesaris ira mihi nocuit, quem solis ab ortu
> solis ad occasus utraque terra tremit.

> I've been injured by the anger of Caesar, who strikes fear on earth from the setting of the sun and to its rising.

On one level, this passage is meant to point up the gratuitous excess and sheer menace of the *princeps*' "divine" wrath;[7] at the same time, it plainly emphasizes the extent of Rome's reach over the world. It is worth noting here that for the Romans in the age of Augustus the furthest reach of their empire signified the very extent of the known civilized world.[8] This point was no doubt reinforced in the city by reports of the successful military campaigns of the *princeps* and his family that pushed the rule of Rome outward, extending civilization itself into the unknown world beyond its borders. It is there, at the nexus between the known and the unknown, where Ovid spends his exile; and when reading these poems, we ought to keep in mind the idea that the poet is privy to knowledge otherwise unavailable at the center of the empire.

Yet what did Augustus gain from sending Ovid to the Black Sea? At the time of his exile in 8 AD, Tomis defined the edge of the civilized world for the Romans, and as the principal port of the western region of the Black Sea, it also held critical importance for the military control of what later became known as the province of Moesia.[9] In nearby Pannonia, the Roman world had undergone "the worst war since those against Carthage" in quelling the Great Illyrian Revolt between 6–9 AD.[10] In the words of J.J. Wilkes, the conquest and retention of the area

[7] Cf. *Tr.* 5.12.14: *plus ualet humanis uiribus ira dei* "the god's anger is stronger than human force." See above, Ch. 6 193, on the oft recurring adonean *ira principis* as an effective "line of attack" against the *princeps*, Syme 1978, 223.

[8] Kienast 1999, 334: "schon seit Sulla [waren] in Rom der Gedanke der Weltherrschaft und die Gleichsetzung des *imperium Romanum* mit dem *orbis terrrarum* zu einer Selbstverständlichkeit geworden."

[9] See Intro. 5 with n. 18.

[10] Suet. *Tib.* 16.1: *sed nuntiata Illyrici defectione transiit* [Tiberius] *ad curam noui belli, quod grauissimum omnium externorum bellorum post Punica* "But when the defection of Illyricum was announced, Tiberius entered into the conduct of a new war, which was the most dire of all external conflicts after the Punic Wars;" Dio 56.16.4; also cited by Wilkes 1996, 553–554.

around Tomis, including the Danubian lands to the north and west, was "the distinguishing achievement of Augustus' Principate."[11] The territory around Tomis was in the news, as it were, just prior to Ovid's banishment, and the reports about it had to have been grim. The *princeps* may very well have chosen it because it belonged to his most recent territorial acquisition and was reputed to be among the most dreary and dangerous places within the empire. Its chief attraction for Ovid's relegation seems to lie in its utter unsuitability for a scholarly poet known for urbanity and an impertinent wit. The poet appears to have suffered extreme physical and mental duress because of the place, and the bleakness of the land he describes may account for the notably manic spirit permeating these poems.[12]

It would hardly be amiss to suggest that Augustus chose Tomis not to punish the poet but to torture him. Of course, this is mere speculation, and we may never truly know why the emperor decided on Tomis for Ovid's *relegatio*.[13] It is clear, however, that his choice was unusual and otherwise unprecedented: there is no other instance of banishment to the Black Sea—whether *relegatio*, *exilium*, or *deportatio*—from all of Roman history (Ch. 2 51). Yet even if we cannot know *why*, we might still ask *how*, that is, we might consider whether, in addition to hearing tales of carnage from the lower Danube, Augustus had also *seen* something that influenced his choice. It is at least conceivable and perhaps likely that the name *Tomis* appeared on M. Vipsanius Agrippa's map of the empire, which the emperor himself is believed to have had set up in the *Porticus Vipsania* between 7–2 BC.[14] Although it cannot be proved on the basis of our current evidence regarding the map, a detailed depiction of the western coast of the Black Sea may well have included Tomis, whose extreme distance from the center of the empire may have struck Augustus as uncannily apt for punishing a poet so importunately keen on his place in the city (cf. *Ars* 2.113–128).

Agrippa's map of the empire was itself a vivid demonstration of geopolitical power; it made Rome's control of space and the extent of her geographical knowledge visible to all in the city. It is perhaps relevant to our understanding of the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto*, then, that Ovid

[11] Wilkes 1996, 585.

[12] Most evident in the curse poems *Tr.* 1.8; 3.11; 4.9; 5.8; *Pont.* 4.3, and *Ibis*, on which see Williams' excellent 1996 study, *The Curse of Exile*, esp. Chs. 2 and 5.

[13] Cf. Nisbet 1982, 51 n. 22.

[14] Nicolet 1991, 99–102.

is the first Roman writer on record to express so clearly what may have been obvious throughout the empire and what Agrippa's map was surely meant to display: that the limits of Rome's rule were the very same as the limits of the known world, *Fast.* 2.683–684:

> gentibus est aliis tellus data limite certo:
> Romanae spatium est urbis et orbis idem.
>
> To the rest of the nations land has been allotted with a defined limit: the extent of the city of Rome and the extent of the known world is the same.

It can hardly be coincidental that this happens in that period of Roman affairs in which Claude Nicolet has noticed that "geography begins to *influence* history."[15] In reference to Agrippa's famous map, Nicolet notes,

> Is it a coincidence that the first occurrence of the famous linking of *orbis* and *urbs* appears precisely in the Augustan period, in the work of a poet in Augustus's entourage, on the occasion of the great naumachia contemporaneous with the dedication of the Temple of Mars that served as a symbolic prelude to the Eastern campaign of C. Caesar: *atque ingens orbis in urbe fuit* ["and a great world was in our city"] Ov. *Ars* 1.174, a formula that strangely foreshadows that used by Pliny about Agrippa's map?[16]

Nicolet's question has its rhetorical point in demonstrating Ovid's concerns with the politics of empire and the acquisition of territory, concerns that are brought to the fore in the exile poetry, as shown in the passage from *Pont.* 1.4 cited above.[17] As for the actual place of exile, it is not entirely implausible that Augustus purposefully sent Ovid to the very margins of the world that the poet was the first to recognize as Roman (and in the *Ars* no less, the very poem for which he was punished!). Does this indicate another level of mental torture and a further mark of a tyrant's cruelty? It is hard to say, but however we answer, the possibility still exists that the dramatic visual representation of space on Agrippa's map—an unmistakable expression of imperial power—

[15] Nicolet 1991, 9. (emphasis his)

[16] Nicolet 1991, 99. Pliny's formula was, *Nat.* 3.17: *orbem terrarum urbi spectandum propositurus* "in order to put the world on view to Rome;" and see Nicolet 1991, 110, where he cites in addition, Plin. *Nat.* 36.101: *urbis nostrae miracula…sic quoque terrarum orbem uictum ostendere* "the wonders of Rome … also include demonstrating the conquering of the world;" 3.40: *una cunctarum gentium in toto orbe patria* (in eulogy of Italy) "a single homeland for every nation in the whole world;" Kettemann 1999, 722, notes that *orbis Scythicus* at *Tr.* 3.12.51 is a playful pendant to *orbis Romanus*.

[17] See Habinek 1998, 151–169; *ib.* 2002, 55–61; and cf. Hexter 2007, 211.

influenced the *princeps*, whose disproportionate anger may have made him susceptible to unusual cruelty in Ovid's case. Again, we will never know, and history will never stop supplying similarly cruel and inexplicable curiosities. Perhaps the most we can do here is note that what the *princeps* bequeathed—whether at random or by design—the poet exploited: he turned his own geographical separation on the margins of the known world into an expression of deep-seated, personal alienation knowable to all in the city.

I do not mean to be flippant, then, when I say that Augustus chose well for a poet so in tune with the literary tradition and likely to make use of his physical marginalization for poetic ends. For the western portion of the Black Sea region was known to most educated Romans rather generally as "Scythia," a point Ovid underscores repeatedly in his poems from exile.[18] The land itself had also been in recent memory the subject of the Scythian ethnographical excursus in Vergil's *Georgics* (3.349–383).[19] Like Vergil, Ovid draws on other literary representations of the cold and unforgiving nature of the territory in the Black Sea region for topological purposes: it serves as a counter-example to the conventionally ideal landscape of the Italian peninsula and the area around Rome. The land is thus represented as barbaric, and its characteristics befit its correspondingly barbaric inhabitants.[20] The inhabitants themselves are a foil for the cultivated Romans absent from Ovid's life, and whether the savage *Getae* or *Coralli* covered in animal hides, they are clearly marked as other and unknowns and figuratively

---

[18] E.g. *Tr.* 1.3.61: *denique 'quid propero? Scythia est, quo mittimur', inquam* "'Why I am hurrying?' I said finally: 'it's Scythia I've been sent to';" 3.2.1–2: *ergo erat in fatis Scythiam quoque uisere nostris, / quaeque Lycaonio terra sub axe iacet* "so it was also my destiny to visit the land of Scythia, which lies beneath the Lycaonian pole;" 4.9.17: *quod Scythicis habitem longe summotus in oris* "that I live far away on Scythian shores;" *Pont.* 4.6.5: *in Scythia nobis quinquennis olympias acta est* "I've passed the five-year cycle of the Olympic games in Scythia."

[19] Cf. Thomas 1988 vol. 2, 108. On Ovid's use of Vergil's ethnography of Scythia, cf. Helzle 1989, 14–16; and see ib. 159–160, on correspondences with Herodotus 4.28ff. More recently, Grebe 2004, 120–121; Claassen 1999, 221–222; Kettemann 1999, 722.

[20] Cf. *Tr.* 5.7.43–44: *locus est inamabilis, et quo / esse nihil toto tristius orbe potest* "this bitter place than which there can be nothing more sad in all the world," on which see Luck 1977, ad *Tr.* 5.7.43ff.: "Die Landschaft und ihr Klima entspricht ganz dem Charakter der Menschen;" cf. Helzle 2003, 77, on the *asperitas loci* motif, and note Helzle 1988, 81–82: "The characteristically Ovidian trait about the use of τὸ πρέπον, however, is the shift in its application from the purely stylistic sphere to the area of choice of subject." The two worst things about Tomis, the cold and the violence, are expressed elegantly in the following pentameter, *Pont.* 2.2.94: *terraque pacis inops undaque uincta gelu* "land devoid of peace and water fixed hard by ice."

emblematic of the poet's alienation from home. As represented in the exile poetry, Tomis defines the exilic condition of the poet, cast out of the city and forced to live in isolation: the land is as much a symptom of his wretched state as a cause.[21]

Like the mythical *exempla* that fill these poems, Ovid's representation of his place of exile and its inhabitants contributes to creating a fictional space—the poetic world of the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto*[22]—in which the poet turns the obvious historical disadvantage of exile to his own rhetorical advantage in verse. There, his forced geographical separation from Rome becomes part of a larger metaphorical motif—the trope of exile itself—that vividly captures the poet's glaring lack of imperial favor in the city and apparent mistreatment at the emperor's hands. What Ovid himself says about his case—it was a private wrong punished in a highly public fashion (Ch. 2)—strongly suggests that the punishment of exile was excessive, the unforeseen and otherwise inexplicable whim of a vengeful autocrat. Yet the poet adopts an unfailingly submissive stance vis-à-vis Augustus that appears paradoxical in light of the excess of the punishment. I hope to have shown in this study that the poet's paradox is also Augustus': the inevitability of *princeps*' deification by senatorial decree brings with it a concomitant and inevitable submission to the voice of the poet. Ultimately, the poet's voice is what helps to reify at least one aspect of the emperor's prospective divinity: immortality. Unlike in the case of the legal rights he wields, the rituals he performs, or even the wars he wages, Augustus can never fully control his personal image in Ovid's verse (Chs. 3 & 6). Barring the complete silencing of the poet, the nature of the emperor's immortality—the *kind of god* he is, whether benevolent or vengeful, measured or capricious—rests entirely in the poet's hands.[23]

This helps to explain why the rhetoric of poetic immortality is so critical to understanding Ovid's poetry of exile and why it ought not to be disregarded as an obligatory appeal to a familiar convention. The convention itself and the authority of a literary tradition behind it provide Ovid with a potential counterpoise to the terrific power of the *princeps* (Ch. 3). Indeed, when the poet counts as just a punishment that

[21] Cf. *Tr.* 5.7.56: *non hominis culpa, sed ista loci* "that's not the fault of the man, but of the place;" 5.12.36: [carmina] *digna sui domini tempore, digna loco* "the poetry is worthy of both its author's condition and his place;" and cf. *Tr.* 3.14.51–52; 4.1.1–2.

[22] See Viarre 1988, 149: "l'inclusion du mythe dans le pays réel . . . [cause] le devenir mythique de son pays d'exil."

[23] Cf. Feeney 1991, 210–212.

was surely excessive (Ch. 2); when he accepts at face-value the power of gods he has only just created in verse (Ch. 3); or when he professes to prefer death to the knowledge of having wronged Augustus (Ch. 4), the reader may well understand that fear is motivating an apparently contradictory rhetorical position (Ch. 4, "Preliminary Conclusion"). The overall impression of these poems is that from Rome to Tomis and throughout the empire the *princeps* acts as a figure of menace rather than benevolence. In consequence, a reading of the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* is bound to leave Augustus' oft-burnished image of clemency indelibly tarnished.

Scant comfort, no doubt, for the banished poet. And yet there is for him some immediate refuge in verse, refuge of an intellectual kind, that lies beyond the seemingly boundless geographical reach and imminent physical control of the emperor. In this space resides, ultimately, the art of poetry itself, which sustains Ovid in exile and enables him to respond to his abject condition there (Chs. 5 & 6). Those responses take shape in the poems he sends back to Rome, where they serve to remind all in the city of a singular miscalculation in the emperor's legal tack and the punishment of *relegatio*: out of sight is hardly out of mind. Ovid's exilic voice continues to recreate his presence in Rome, where it laments unfailingly. Whether we accept that the poet's lament aptly reflects the changing state of affairs at Rome—to say nothing of the plight of the universal exile—it is nevertheless clear that Ovid's exile results directly from Augustus' concentration of political power into his own hands. In the end, it is the establishment of the first principate that makes possible the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto*, whose uniqueness because of this has often been remarked.[24] The poems take on, in turn, an added didactic significance regarding the state of literary affairs under the recently reconfigured political system.[25] They appear to teach us that there is no more room for Ovid in the new Rome (Ch. 5), that the poet has been forced out of the Augustan city in both a literal and figurative sense. In Aristotelian terms (Ch. 1, 32 with n. 60), perhaps the primary lesson of the exile poetry is that what actually happened to

[24] Above Intro. 14 with n. 52, and noted memorably by Gibbon in the *Decline and Fall*, Ch. xviii n. 40 (Womersley 1994, 656): "The nine books of Poetic Epistles ... possess, besides the merit of elegance, a double value. They exhibit a picture of the human mind under very singular circumstances; and they contain many curious observations, which no Roman, except Ovid, could have an opportunity of making."

[25] Cf. Syme 1978, 168.

Ovid at the end of the first principate is what necessarily would have happened to the kind of poet that appears in the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto*.[26]

Of course, when it happens and he finally does leave Rome, he exits forever into the permanent exile of his exilic verse.[27] Once there, where he determines to die metaphorically to his former life and to live by means of future fame, he appears to make good on his promise from the end of the *Metamorphoses* to live on after death in the mouths of men. In a sense, the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* fulfill the poetics of immortality as revealed at the end of Ovid's epic poem on changing forms, a recurring coda as it were to the most famous epilogue (*sphragis*) in Latin literature. There, of course, Ovid claims to live on in the lives of men, *Met.* 15.878–879:

> ore legar populi, perque omnia saecula fama,
>   siquid habent ueri uatum praesagia, uiuam.
>
> People will read my works out loud, and if the prophecies of bards have any truth to them, via fame through every age I shall have life.

The end of this poem marks the apex of Ovid's success while in Rome and provides the most powerful witness to his claim to immortality. These verses stand as a public prediction to outlast what the *princeps* has done in the city, readily observable for example in the temples he built or restored. It is no surpise that when confronted with another instantiation of the emperor's power—legal banishment to the most recently acquired imperial land (Chs. 1 & 2)—Ovid consciously imitates the lan-

---

[26] The most vivid example of what kind of poet this is appears in Ovid's autobiography, *Tr.* 4.10, which begins, 1–2: *ille ego qui fuerim, tenerorum lusor amorum, / quem legis, ut noris, accipe, posteritas* "that you may know who I was, that poet of playful Loves, whom you now read: listen, Posterity." Other examples abound, for instance, *Tr.* 2, Ovid's literary apology for his career as a poet, esp. 237–578. And yet an almost eerie prediction of Ovid's changed status in exile can be found in his own epic, in Venus' rationale for turning the Cerastae into bulls, *Met.* 10.230–234: '*sed quid loca grata, quid urbes / peccauere meae? quod*' *dixit* '*crimen in illis? / exilio poenam potius gens inpia pendat / uel nece uel siquid medium est mortisque fugaeque. idque quid esse potest, nisi uersae poena figurae*?' "She said, 'but in what way did these pleasing locales and cities of mine sin? What crime is there in them? Let rather the impious race pay the price by exile or by execution or whatever lies between death and exile. And what else can that be but the punishment of a metamorphosis'?"

[27] Derek Mahon (1983) appears to imply this about the exile poetry in his poem, "Ovid in Tomis," e.g.: "Better to contemplate / The blank page / And leave it blank / Than modify / Its substance / By as much as a pen-stroke. / Woven of wood nymphs, / It speaks volumes / No one will ever write. / I incline my head / To its candour / And weep for our exile." See McGowan (forthcoming); Ziolkowski 2005, 129.

guage of the *Metamorphoses*' closing, as for example in *Tr.* 3.7.45–54:

> en ego, cum caream patria uobisque domoque,
> raptaque sint, adimi quae potuere mihi,
> ingenio tamen ipse meo comitorque fruorque:
> Caesar in hoc potuit iuris habere nihil.
> quilibet hanc saeuo uitam mihi finiat ense,
> me tamen extincto fama superstes erit,
> dumque suis uictrix septem de montibus orbem
> prospiciet domitum Martia Roma, legar.

> Behold, though I lack my country, you, my family, and my home, and whatever could be taken from me has been snatched away, I still continue to enjoy fully the power of my mind: Caesar could have no right over this. Let someone end this life of mine with a bitter sword, still my fame will survive my death. And as long as triumphant Rome, the city of Mars, looks out over the conquered world from her seven hills, I shall be read.[28]

These verses recognize the bitter loss of country, home, and family incurred by exile, even as they tie the freedom of poetic expression to the longevity of the Roman empire: the two are not so much at odds, as complementary. At the same time, the poet also carves out for himself a position of power—an immortalizing power based on poetic capacity (*ingenium*)—fully independent of the emperor's legal control (*ius*). In essence, the power of Caesar Augustus ends where the artistry of Ovid's verse begins.

The theme of poetic immortality found here and in the *Metamorphoses* makes the epilogue of Ovid's epic a fitting prologue for the *Tristia*.[29] It is thus germane to point out here that the verb *lego* in both places (*Met.* 15.878; *Tr.* 3.7.54) holds at least three possible meanings: to choose, to read, and, in Greek, to speak.[30] Ovid's very next line to appear in Rome

[28] See also 4.10.125–132: *nam tulerint magnos cum saecula nostra poetas, / non fuit ingenio fama maligna meo, / cumque ego praeponam multos mihi, non minor illis / dicor et in toto plurimus orbe legor. / si quid habent igitur uatum praesagia ueri, / protinus ut moriar, non ero, terra, tuus. / siue fauore tuli, siue hanc ego carmine famam, / iure tibi grates, candide lector, ago.* "For though this age of ours has produced great poets, fame has not begrudged my genius; and though I put many before myself, I'm not said to be lesser than they, and in all the world I am the most read. If the predictions of sacred bards have any truth—even though I die forthwith—I shall not be yours, earth. But if through favor or by poetry I have won this fame, kind reader, rightly do I give you thanks;" *Pont.* 2.6.33–34: *crede mihi, nostrum si non mortale futurum est / carmen, in ore frequens posteritatis eris* "believe me, if our poetry is not destined to partake of death, you will often be spoken of in posterity." On the poetics of immortality more generally, cf. *Tr.* 1.6.35–36; 3.3.77–78; 3.4a.45–46; 4.9.19–26; 4.10.2; 5.14.5–6, 33–42; *Pont.* 3.2.29–30; 4.7.53–54.

[29] As implied by Johnson 2008, 122–124.

[30] Planudes emphasizes the last two elements in his translation, καὶ αὐτὸς τοῖς τῶν

after the *Metamorphoses*—presumably his first words to be chosen and read out loud in the city now denied to him—begins with a speech-act, a direct address to the book itself that opens his sad songs from exile and leads the reader into the personal pathos on view in the *Tristia*, 1.1.1–2:

> Parue—nec inuideo—sine me, liber, ibis in Vrbem,
> ei mihi, quod domino non licet ire tuo!
>
> You will go to Rome without me, little book, and I don't resent you for it. Oh me, that it's not permitted for your master to go!

At the outset of this study, I connected this passage to the poet's ability to overcome the punishment of exile even as he seems to be submitting to it: what looks, exoterically, like submission becomes, in the text's essence, an expression of poetic power and self-sufficiency. For after the opening address, Ovid's book circumvents the legal ban on the poet, returns to Rome, and offers an implicit challenge to the *princeps*' control over the literary activity in the city.

At the same time, the tattered state of the bookroll itself aptly reflects the harsh reality of Ovid's altered state in exile. In this sense, the exile poetry continues not only the rhetoric of immortality so essential to the *Metamorphoses*, but also the epic's theme of changing bodies. Now, however, the poetic *corpus* is filled not with figures of myth and past history, but with persons in real life and present time. The poet's own transformation marks a professional metamorphosis of sorts from celebrated love-poet, aetiologist, and mythographer to banished *uates* of unremitting lament. Not surprisingly, Ovid instructs his book later in the first poem from exile to address his *Metamorphoses* and have the newly reshaped face of his own misfortune added to their contents, *Tr.* 1.1.117–122:

> sunt quoque mutatae, ter quinque uolumina, formae,
> nuper ab exequiis carmina rapta meis.

δήμων ἀναγνωσθήσομαι στόμασι, / καὶ τῇ φήμῃ δι' αἰῶνος παντὸς (εἴ τινός ποτε ἀληθείας / τὰ τῶν ποιητῶν ἔχεται προφοιβάσματα) ζήσομαι. "And I shall be read aloud in the people's mouths, and if the predictions of poets have any truth to them, I shall live in fame for all time." Cf. Fraenkel 1957, 265: "The cultural world in which the mind of an educated Roman moved was composed of a Greek and a Roman sphere. No picture of man's experience was complete unless both spheres were viewed together. This fundamental situation found a natural expression in a number of passages of the Augustan poets, where it produced both variation and comprehensiveness in an arrangement sometimes distinguished by a pleasing symmetry."

his mando dicas, inter mutata referri
 fortunae uultum corpora posse meae.
namque ea dissimilis subito est effecta priori,
 flendaque nunc, aliquo tempore laeta fuit.

The fifteen volumes of changed forms are there too, poems recently snatched from my funeral pyre. I bid you to tell them that among the bodies changed can be counted the face of my misfortune. For that too has suddenly been made unlike to what it was before: now it's tearful when at another time it was happy.

In one of the most perceptive articles to date on the relationship of the exile poetry to Ovid's earlier work, Stephen Hinds (1985, 20) has observed of this passage:

The 'aspect' of his own *fortuna*, the poet states, has suddenly become different from what it was before, a source of sorrow where it was once full of joy; therefore the *Tristia* book is to tell the books of the *Metamorphoses* that this *uultus* is one which merits inclusion in their catalogue of changed bodies.

Hinds goes on to suggest that the alternate preface for the *Metamorphoses* that Ovid adds later in *Tristia* 1.7 not only rewrites that poem and duly changes its shape, but also changes the reading of it from now on.[31]

Yet it is also pertinent to note, in a way slightly different from that of Hinds, that the poet appears to be instructing his audience on how to read his sprawling epic and, by extension, his exile poetry. External aspect, it seems, is but one form of truth and valid only for understanding the surface. The exterior of Ovid's book—unpolished, forlorn, and full of woe—does not necessarily represent the internal essence of its contents—learned, witty, and beset by foreboding; the

[31] *Tr.* 1.7.35–40: *orba parente suo quicumque uolumina tangis, / his saltem uestra detur in urbe locus. / quoque magis faueas, haec non sunt edita ab ipso, / sed quasi de domini funere rapta sui. / quicquid in his igitur uitii rude carmen habebit, / emendaturus, si licuisset, erat.* "All you who touch the books bereft of their father, to them at least let a place be given in your city. May you favor them all the more since they weren't published by their author, but snatched from what looked like his funeral. Therefore, he would have emended whatever mistake the unfinished poem still has, had it been permitted." See Hinds 1985, 26: "Ovid, then, offers in Tristia 1.7, as at the end of Tristia 1.1, a newly pessimistic way into the *Metamorphoses*; and the terms in which that pessimism is expressed are highly significant ... this new preface, combined with the new ending already proposed in the first elegy, will have the effect of making the *Metamorphoses as a whole* more pessimistic—more suited, in fact, to an age of *Tristia*. *Tristia* 1.7, then, is not a poem about the *Metamorphoses per se*: it is a poem about how the *Metamorphoses* can be redeployed, how it can be rewritten, to reflect the circumstances of Ovid's exile, and thus, ultimately, to help him book his trip home."

physical can never quite capture the metaphysical. Even though Ovid's *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* look feeble, even dead, on the outside, the poet's voice within is still very much alive, and that voice continues to to bear witness to his abject condition in exile and to Augustus' role therein. Above all, it lays claim to a poetic immortality that contrasts tellingly with the temporal power the *princeps* holds, for example, over the practice of Roman religion and law. Today, we may debate whether this is enough to right a wrong and offset the burden of exile—in short, whether there is redress—but Ovid's claim is as yet irrefutable, and the poet, evidently, lives on.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Reference Works

CIL	*Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*. Berlin. 1863–.
Ernout-Meillet	A. Ernout and A. Meillet. *Dictionnaire Étymologique de la Langue Latine*. Paris. 1959.
EV	F. Della Corte, ed. *Enciclopedia Virgiliana*. Vol. 1–5. Rome. 1984–1990.
ISM	D.M. Pippidi *et al. Inscriptiones Scythiae Minoris*. Bucharest. 1983–1987.
NP	H. Cancik and H. Schneider, eds. *Der Neue Pauly. Enzyklopädie der antiken Welt.* Vols. 1–16. Stuttgart. 1996–2003.
OCD	*Oxford Classical Dictionary*. 3rd ed. Oxford. 1996.
OLD	*Oxford Latin Dictionary*. Oxford. 1968–1982.
PIR^2	*Prosopographia Imperii Romani.* 2nd ed. Berlin-Leipzig. 1933–.
RE	G. Wissowa *et al. Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft.* Stuttgart. 1894–1975.
TLL	*Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*. Leipzig-Munich. 1900–.

Abbreviations in Bibliography

ANRW	*Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt. Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neuen Forschung*. New York-Berlin. 1972–.
Atti	*Atti del convegno internazionale ovidiano, Sulmona, maggio 1958*. 2 vols. Rome. 1959.
CAH	*The Cambridge Ancient History*. Cambridge. 1923–.
CHCL	*Cambridge History of Classical Literature*. II. *Latin Literature.* W.V. Clausen and E.J. Kenney, eds. Cambridge. 1982.
Ovidiana	N.I. Herescu *et al.*, eds. *Ovidiana: Recherches sur Ovide, publiées à l'occasion du bimillénaire de la naissance du poète*. Paris. 1958.
Ovidianum	N. Barbu, E. Dobroiu, M. Nasta, eds. *Ovidianum. Acta conventus omnium gentium Ovidianis studiis fovendis*. Bucharest. 1976.
Ovidio	G. Papponetti, ed. *Ovidio, Poeta della Memoria. Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi. Sulmona, 19–21 ottobre 1989*. Rome.
Werk und Wirkung	W. Schubert, ed. *Ovid: Werk und Wirkung. Festgabe für Michael von Albrecht zum 65. Geburtstag*. 2 vols. Frankfurt a. M. 1999.

Authors

Ahl, F.M. 1984a. "The Rider and the Horse: Politics and Power in Roman Poetry from Horace to Statius." *ANRW* II.32.1: 40–124.
———, 1984b. "The Art of Safe Criticism in Greece and Rome." *AJP* 105: 174–208.
Albert, W. 1988. *Das mimetische Gedicht in der Antike*. Frankfurt a. M.
vonAlbrecht, M. 1994. *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*. Vol. 1. 2nd ed. Munich.
vonAlbrecht, M. and E. Zinn, eds. 1968. *Ovid*. Darmstadt.
Alexiou, M. 1974. *The Ritual Lament in Greek Tradition*. Cambridge.
Allen, A.W. 1950. "Sincerity and the Roman elegists." *CP* 45: 145–160.
Amann, M. 2006. *Komik in den Tristien Ovids*. Basel.
Ando, C., ed. 2003. *Roman Religion*. Edinburgh.
André, J. 1963. *Ovide. Contre Ibis*. Paris.
Austin, R.G. 1964. *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Secundus*. Oxford.
Axelson, B. 1945. *Unpoetische Wörter. Ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis der lateinischen Dichtersprache*. Lund.
Bakker, J.T. 1946. *Publii Ovidii Tristium Liber V*. Amsterdam.
Barchiesi, A. 1993. "Insegnare ad Augusto: Orazio, *Epistole* 2, 1 e Ovidio, *Tristia* II." In J.S. Clay, P. Mitsis, and A. Schiesaro, eds. *The Didactic Addressee*. Pisa. Special issue of *MD* no. 31: 149–184.
———, 1997. *The Poet and the Prince: Ovid and the Augustan Discourse*. Berkeley.
Bauer, D.F. 1962. "The Function of Pygmalion in the *Metamorphoses* of Ovid." *TAPA* 93: 1–21.
Beard, M. 1987. "A complex of times: No more sheep on Romulus' birthday." *PCPhS* n.s. 33: 1–15.
Beard, M. and J. North, eds. 1990. *Pagan Priests: Religion and Power in the Ancient World*. Ithaca, NY.
Beard, M., J. North, and S.R.F. Price, eds. 1998. *Religions of Rome. Vol. 1: A History. Vol. 2: A Sourcebook*. Cambridge.
Benedum, J. 1967. *Studien zur Dichtkunst des späten Ovids*. Diss. Giessen.
Benveniste, É. 1969. *Le vocabulaire des institutions indo-européennes*. Vol. 2. Paris.
Berger, A. 1953. *Encyclopedic Dictionary of Roman Law*. Philadelphia.
Bernhardt, U. 1986. *Die Funktion der Kataloge in Ovids Exilpoesie*. Hildesheim.
Berrino, N.F. and A. Luisi. 2002. Culpa Silenda. *Le elegie dell'*error *ovidiano*. Bari.
Bienek, H. 1990. "Exile is Rebellion." In J. Glad, ed. *Literature in Exile*. Durham, NC. 41–48.
Billerbeck, M. 1999. *Seneca.* Hercules Furens. *Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar*. Leiden.
Bleicken, J. 1962. *Senatsgericht und Kaisergericht: Eine Studie zur Entwicklung des Prozessrechts im frühen Prinzipat*. Göttingen.
Boissier, G. 1909. *L'opposition sous les Césars*. Paris.
Bömer, F. 1952. Review of L. Castiglioni, ed. *P. Ovidii Nasonis Fastorum libri VI*. Torino: 1950. *Gnomon* 24: 324–328.
———, 1957. "Beiträge zum Verständnis der augusteischen Dichtersprache." *Gymnasium* 64: 1–21.

———, 1958. *P. Ovidius Naso: Die Fasten*. Vol. 2. Heidelberg.
———, 1986. *P. Ovidius Naso: Die Metamorphosen*. Vol. 7. Heidelberg.
Born, L.K. 1934. "The Perfect Prince according to the Latin Panegyrists." *AJP* 55: 20–35.
Bowersock, G. 1965. *Augustus and the Greek World*. Oxford.
Boyancé, P. 1955. "Sur la théologie de Varron." *REA* 57: 57–84. (Repr. in Boyancé 1972)
———, 1972. *Études sur la religion romaine*. Rome.
Boyle, A.J. 1997. "Postscripts from the Edge: Exilic *Fasti* and imperialised Rome." *Ramus* 26.1: 7–28.
———, 2003. *Ovid and the Monuments: A Poet's Rome*. Bendigo, Victoria, Australia.
Braund, S.M. 1998. "Praise and Protreptic in Early Imperial Panegyric: Cicero, Seneca, Pliny." In M. Whitby, ed. *The Propaganda of Power: The Role of Panegyric in Late Antiquity*. Leiden. 53–76.
Bretzigheimer, G. 1991. "*Exul ludens*. Zur Rolle von *relegans* und *relegatus* in Ovids *Tristien*." *Gymnasium* 98: 39–76.
Brink, C.O. 1971. *Horace on Poetry, Vol. 2. Ars Poetica*. Cambridge.
———, 1982. *Horace on Poetry, Vol. 3. Epistles Book II*. Cambridge.
Brunt, P.A. and J.M. Moore, eds. 1967. *Res Gestae Divi Augusti. The Achievements of the Divine Augustus*. Oxford.
Carcopino, J. 1963. "L'Exile d'Ovide, poète neopythagoricien." In *Rencontres de l'histoire et de la littérature romaines*. Paris. 59–170.
Cardauns, B. 1976. *M. Terentius Varro,* Antiquitates Rerum Divinarum. *Fragmente und Kommentar*. Wiesbaden.
———, 1978. "Varro und die römische Religion. Zur Theologie, Wirkungsgeschichte und Leistung der '*Antiquitates Rerum Divinarum*'." *ANRW* II 16.1: 80–103.
Casali, S. 1997. "*Quaerenti plura legendum*: On the necessity of 'reading more' in Ovid's Exile Poetry." *Ramus* 26.1: 80–112.
Catalano, P. 1987. "Ius." *EV* 3: 66–72.
Chwalek, B. 1996. *Die Verwandlung des Exils in die elegische Welt. Studien zu den* Tristia *und* Epistulae ex Ponto *Ovids*. Frankfurt a.M.
Ciccarelli, I. 2003. *Commento al II Libro dei* Tristia *di Ovidio*. Bari.
Cipriano, P. 1978. *Fas Nefas*. Roma.
Claassen, J.-M. 1986. *Poeta, exsul, vates: A stylistic and literary analysis of Ovid's* Tristia *and* Epistulae ex Ponto. Diss. Stellenbosch.
———, 1987. "*Error* and the imperial household: an angry god and the exiled Ovid's fate." *Acta Classica* 30: 31–48.
———, 1988. "Ovid's Poems from Exile. The Creation of a Myth and the Triumph of Poetry." *Antike und Abendland* 34: 158–169.
———, 1989a. "Meter and Emotion in Ovid's exilic poetry." *CW* 82: 351–365.
———, 1989b. "*Carmen* and poetics: Poetry as enemy and friend." In C. Deroux, ed., *Studies in Latin literature and Roman history, vol. 5*. Bruxelles. 252–266.
———, 1991. "Une analyse stylistique et littéraire d'Ovide (Epistulae ex Ponto 3,3)." *LEC* 59: 27–41.

——, 1996. "Exile, death and immortality: Voices from the grave." *Latomus* 55.3: 571–590.
——, 1999. *Displaced Persons: Literature of Exile from Cicero to Boethius*. Madison, WI.
——, 2001. "The singular myth: Ovid's use of myth in the exilic poetry." *Hermathena* 170: 11–64.
Clay, J.S. 1983. *The Wrath of Athena: Gods and Men in the* Odyssey. Princeton.
Clausen, W.V. 1994. *A Commentary on Virgil. Eclogues*. Oxford.
Clauss, M. 1999. *Kaiser und Gott. Herrscherkult im römischen Reich*. Stuttgart-Leipzig.
Cohen, S.T. 2007. "Cicero's Roman Exile." In Gaertner 2007: 109–128.
Colakis, M. 1987. "Ovid as *praeceptor amoris* in *Epistulae ex Ponto* 3.1." *CJ* 82: 210–215.
Coleman, K.M. 1988. *Statius. Silvae IV*. Oxford.
Coleman, R. 1977. *Vergil. Eclogues*. Cambridge.
Conte, G.B. 1994. *A History of Latin Literature*. Baltimore.
Courtney, E. 2003 (2nd ed.). *The Fragmentary Latin Poets. Edited with Commentary*. Oxford.
Crook, J. 1967. *Law and Life of Rome*. Ithaca, NY.
Daube, D. 1969. *Roman Law: Linguistic, Social and Philosophical Aspects*. Edinburgh.
Davis, P.J. 2002. "The Colonial Subject in Ovid's Exile Poetry." *AJP* 123: 257–273.
——, 2006. *Ovid and Augustus: A political reading of Ovid's erotic poems*. London.
Davisson, M.H.T. 1984. "*Magna tibi imposita est nostris persona libellis*: Playwright and Actor in Ovid's *Epistulae ex Ponto* 3.1." *CJ* 79: 324–339.
——, 1985. "*Tristia* 5.13 and Ovid's use of epistolary form and content." *CJ* 80: 238–246.
——, 1993. "*Quid moror exemplis*?: Mythological *exempla* in Ovid's pre-exilic poems and the elegies from exile." *Phoenix* 47: 213–237.
Della Corte, F. 1972. *I Tristia. Traduzione*. Genova.
——, 1973. *I Tristia. Commento*. Genova.
——, 1976. "Ovidio e i barbari danubiani." *RomBarb* 1: 57–69.
Deremetz, A. and J. Fabre-Serris, eds. 1999. *Élégie et Épopée dan la poésie ovidienne, Héroides et Amours: en hommage à Simone Viarre*. Lille.
Dewar, M. 2002. "*Siquid habent veri vatum praesagia*: Ovid in the 1st–5th centuries A.D." In Boyd 2002: 383–412.
Dinter, B. 1858. "De Ouidii ex Ponto libris commentatio prima." Programm Grimae.
Dimcock, G.E. Jr. 1991. "The Name of Odysseus." In H. Bloom, ed. *Odysseus / Ulysses*. New York-Philadelphia. 103–117. (Repr. from *Hudson Review* 9 (1956) 52–70.)
Doblhofer, E. 1987. *Exil und Emigration: Zum Erlebnis der Heimatferne in der römischen Literatur*. Darmstadt.
Döpp, S. 1968. *Vergilischer Einfluss im Werk Ovids*. Munich.
Dörrie, H. 1968. *Der heroische Brief*. Berlin.
Drucker, M. 1977. *Der verbannte Dichter und der Kaisergott. Studien zu Ovids späten Elegien*. Diss. Heidelberg.

Dyck, A.R. 2004. *A Commentary on Cicero,* De Legibus. Ann Arbor.
Ehlers, W.-W. 1988. "Poet und Exil." *A & A* 34: 144–157.
Ehwald, R. and F.W. Levy, eds. 1922. *P. Ovidius Naso Tristium libri V, Ibis, Ex Ponto libri IV.* Leipzig.
Elliott, A.G. 1985. "Ovid and the Critics: Seneca, Quintilian, and 'Seriousness'." *Helios* 12: 9–20.
Else, G.F. 1957. *Aristotle's Poetics: The Argument.* Cambridge, Mass.
Erbse, H., ed. 1969. *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem (Scholia Vetera).* Vol. 1 (*praefationem et scholia ad libros A-Δ continens*). Berlin.
Evans, H.B. 1983. *Publica Carmina: Ovid's Books from Exile.* Lincoln, Nebraska.
Fabre-Serris, J. 1995. *Mythe et poésie dans les Métamorphoses d'Ovide*: *fonctions et significations de la mythologie dans la Rome augustéenne.* Paris.
Fairweather, J. 1987. "Ovid's Autobiographical Poem, *Tristia* 4.10." *CQ* 37: 181–196.
Fantham, E. 1985. "Ovid, Germanicus and the Composition of the *Fasti.*" *PLLS* 5: 243–281.
———, 1998. *Ovid Fasti Book IV.* Cambridge.
———, 2002a. "Women's participation in Roman cult." In G. Herbert-Brown, ed. *Ovid's* Fasti. *Historical Readings at its Bimillennium.* Oxford. 23–46.
———, 2002b. "Ovid's *Fasti*: Politics, History, and Religion." In B.W. Boyd 2002: 197–233.
———, 2007. "Dialogues of Displacement: Seneca's Consolations to Helvia and Polybius." In Gaertner 2007: 173–192.
Fears, J.R. 1981. "The Cult of Jupiter and Roman Imperial Ideology." *ANRW* II 17.1: 3–141.
Feeney, D. 1991. *The Gods in Epic: Poets and Critics of the Classical Tradition.* Oxford.
———, 1992. "*Si licet et fas est*: Ovid's *Fasti* and the Problem of Free Speech under the Principate." In A. Powell, ed. *Roman Poetry and Propaganda in the Age of Augustus.* London.
———, 1998. *Literature and Religion at Rome: Cultures, contexts and beliefs.* Cambridge.
Fishwick, D. 1987. *The Imperial Cult and the Latin West. Studies in the Ruler Cult of the Western Provinces of the Roman Empire.* Vol. 1,1. Leiden.
Fitch, J.G. 1987. *Seneca's* Hercules Furens. *A Critical Text with Introduction and Commentary.* Ithaca-London.
Fitton Brown, A.D. 1985. "The Unreality of Ovid's Tomitan exile." *LCM* 10.2:18–22.
Fraenkel, E. 1957. *Horace.* Oxford.
Fränkel, H. 1945. *Ovid: A poet between two worlds.* Berkeley-Los Angeles.
Frank, T. 1927. "Naevius and Free Speech." *AJP* 48: 105–110.
Frazer, J.G., ed. and trans. 1929. *Fastorum libri sex.* Vol. 3 (Books 3–4). London.
Frier, B.W. 1989. *A Casebook on the Roman Law of Delict.* Atlanta, GA.
Froesch, H.H. 1976. *Ovid als Dichter des Exils.* Bonn.
———, 1987. "Exul poeta—Ovid als Chorführer verbannter oder geflohener Auctoren." In H.-J. Glücklich, ed., *Lateinische Literatur, heute wirkend.* Vol. 1. 51–64.
Gaertner, J.F. 2005. *Ovid* Epistulae ex Ponto, *Book 1. Edited with Introduction, Translation, and Commentary.* Oxford.

——, ed. 2007. *Writing Exile: The Discourse of Displacement in Greco-Roman Antiquity and Beyond*. Leiden-Boston.
——, 2007a. "How exilic is Ovid's exile poetry?" In Gaertner 2007: 155–172.
Gain, D.B. 1976. *The Aratus ascribed to Germanicus Caesar: Edited with an introduction, translation & commentary*. London.
Galasso, L. 1987. "Modelli tragici e ricodificazione elegiaca: appunti sulla poesia ovidiana dell'esilio." *MD* 18: 83–99.
——, 1995. *P. Ovidii Nasonis Epistularum ex Ponto Liber II*. Florence.
Galinsky, G.K. 1996. *Augustan Culture: An Interpretive Introduction*. Princeton.
——, 1998. "The Speech of Pythagoras at Ovid *Metamorphoses* 15.75–478." *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar* 10: 313–336.
Garnsey, P. 1970. *Social Status and Legal Privilege in the Roman Empire*. Oxford.
Gärtner, H.A. 1999. "Ovid und das Imperium Romanum. Zum Gedicht Pont. 2.1." In *Werk und Wirkung*, Vol. 2: 797–804.
Goold, G.P. 1983. "The Causes of Ovid's Exile." *ICS* 8: 94–105.
Gordon, A.E. 1983. *Illustrated Introduction to Latin Epigraphy*. Berkeley-Los Angeles-London.
Gordon, R. 1990. "From Republic to Principate: priesthood, religion and ideology." In M. Beard and J. North, eds. *Pagan Priests: Religion and power in the ancient world*. Ithaca, NY. 177–198.
Gradel, I. 2002. *Emperor Worship and Roman Religion*. Oxford.
Graeber, G. 1881. *Quaestionum Ovidianarum pars prior*. Elberfeld.
Graf, F. 1988. "Ovide, les *Métamorphoses* et la véracité du mythe." In C. Calame, ed. *Métamorphoses du mythe en Grèce antique*. Geneva. 57–70.
——, 1993. "Der Mythos bei den Römern. Forschungs- und Problemsgeschichte." In F. Graf, ed. *Mythos in mythenloser Gesellschaft. Das Paradigma Roms*. Stuttgart-Leipzig. 25–43.
——, 1994. "Die Götter, die Menschen und der Erzähler. Zum Göttermythos in Ovids 'Metamorphosen'." In M. Picone and B. Zimmerman, eds. *Ovidius Redivivus. Von Ovid zu Dante*. Stuttgart-Leipzig. 22–42.
——, 2002. "Myth in Ovid." In P. Hardie. 2002b: 108–121
Grasmück, E.L. 1978. *Exilium. Untersuchungen zur Verbannung in der Antike*. Paderborn.
Grebe, S. 2004. "Rom und Tomis in Ovids *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto*." In A. Hornung, C. Jäkel, W. Schubert, eds. *Studia Humanitatis ac Litterarum Trifolio Heidelbergensi dedicata. Festschrift für Eckhard Christmann, Wilfried Edelmaier und Rudolf Kettemann*. Frankfurt a.M. 115–129.
Green, C.M.C. 2002. "Varro's Three Theologies and their Influence on the *Fasti*." In G. Herbert-Brown 2002: 71–100.
Green, P. 1982. "*Carmen et error*: πρόφασις and αἰτία in the matter of Ovid's exile." *CA* 1: 202–220.
——, trans. 1994. *Ovid. The poems of exile*. London-New York.
Habicht, C. 1973. "Die Augusteische Zeit und das erste Jahrhundert nach Christi Geburt." In W. den Boer, E. Bickerman *et al.*, eds. *Le culte des souverains dans l'empire romain*. Geneva: 39–88.
Habinek, T. 1998. *The Politics of Latin Literature*. Princeton.

——, 2002. "Ovid and empire." In P. Hardie. 2002b: 46–61.
Hall, J.B., ed. 1995. *Tristia*. Stuttgart.
Hallett, J.P. 2003. "Centering from the Periphery in the Augustan Roman world: Ovid's autobiography in *Tristia* 4.10 and Cornelius Nepos' biography of Atticus." *Arethusa* 36: 345–359.
Hardie, P. 1986. *Virgil's Aeneid. Cosmos and Imperium*. Oxford.
——, 2002a. *Ovid's Poetics of Illusion*. Cambridge.
——, ed. 2002b. *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*. Cambridge.
——, 2002c. "Ovid and early imperial literature." In P. Hardie 2002b: 34–45.
Harrison, S. 2002. "Ovid and genre: evolutions of an elegist." In P. Hardie 2002b: 79–94.
Harzer, F. 1997. "*Iste ego sum?*: Ovids poetische Briefschrift zwischen Dichtung und Wahrheit." *Poetica* 29: 48–74.
Hartman, J.J. 1905. *De ovidio poeta*. Leyden.
Häuptli, B.W., ed. & trans. 1996. *Ibis. Fragmente. Ovidiana: lateinisch-deutsch*. Zurich.
Heaney, S. 1995. "The Redress of Poetry." An inaugural lecture delivered before the University of Oxford on 24 October 1989. In *The Redress of Poetry*. New York. 1–16.
Heckel, H. 2003. "Der Dichter und der Gott. Ovid über die Göttlichkeit des Augustus." In G. Binder, B. Effe, R.F. Glei, eds. *Gottmenschen. Konzepte existentieller Grenzüberschreitung im Altertum*. Trier. 67–95.
Heinze, R. 1919. "Ovids elegische Erzählung." *SB. Akad. Lpz., phil.-hist. Kl.* Bd. 71. Heft 7. (= E. Bu rk, ed . *Vom Geist des Römertums*. 2nd ed. Stuttgart. 1960. 308–403).
Helzle, M. 1988. "Ovid's Poetics of Exile." *ICS* 13: 73–83.
——, 1989. *Publii Ouidii Nasonis epistularum ex Ponto liber IV. A commentary on poems 1–7, 16*. Hildesheim.
——, 1989a. "Mr. & Mrs. Ovid." *G&R* 183–193.
——, 2003. *Ovids* Epistulae ex Ponto. *Buch I–II Kommentar*. Heidelberg.
Herbert-Brown, G. 1994. *Ovid and the* Fasti. *An Historical Study*. Oxford.
——, ed. 2002. *Ovid's* Fasti. *Historical Readings at its Bimillennium*. Oxford.
Herescu, N.I. 1958. "Le sens de l'épitaphe ovidienne." *Ovidiana*: 420–442.
Heubeck, A. and A. Hoekstra, eds. 1989. *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey. Vol. II: Books IX–XVI*. Oxford.
Hexter, R.J. 1986. *Ovid and Medieval Schooling. Studies in Medieval School Commentaries on Ovid's* Ars Amatoria, Epistulae ex Ponto, *and* Epistulae Heroidum. Munich.
——, 2002. "Ovid in the Middle Ages: Exile, Mythographer, Lover." In B. Weiden Boyd, ed., *Brill's Companion to Ovid*. Leiden. 413–442.
——, 2007. "Ovid and the Medieval Exilic Imaginary." In Gaertner 2007: 209–236.
Hill, D.E. 2002. "Ovid and Augustus." In C. Damon, J.F. Miller, and K.S. Myers, eds., *Vertis in usum: Studies in Honor of Edward Courtney*. Munich.
Hinds, S. 1985. "Booking the return trip: Ovid and *Tristia* 1." *PCPhS* n.s. 31: 13–32.

———, 1987. "Generalizing about Ovid." *Ramus* 16: 4–31.
———, 1998. *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of appropriation in Roman poetry*. Cambridge.
Hofmann, H. 1987. "The unreality of Ovid's Tomitan exile once again." *LCM* 12: 23.
Hofmann, M. and J. Lasdun, eds. 1994. *After Ovid. New Metamorphoses*. New York.
Hollis, A.S. 1977. *Ovid. Ars Amatoria, Book 1*. Oxford.
Holzberg, N. 1998. *Ovid. Dichter und Werk*. 2nd ed. Munich.
Horsfall, N. 1972. "Varro and Caesar. Three Chronological Problems." *BICS* 19: 120–128.
———, 1993. "Mythological invention and poetica licentia." In F. Graf, ed. *Mythos in mythenloser Gesellschaft. Das Paradigma Roms*. Stuttgart-Leipzig. 131–141.
Housman, A.E. 1972. J. Diggle and F.R.D. Goodyear, eds. *The Classical Papers of A.E. Housman*. 3 vols. Cambridge.
Hutchinson, G.O. 2006. *Propertius: Elegies, Book IV*. Cambridge.
Janko, R., ed. 1992. *The Iliad: A Commentary. Vol. IV: books 13–16*. Cambridge.
Jocelyn, H.D. 1969. "Cn. Naevius, P. Cornelius Scipio and Q. Caecilius Metellus." *Antichthon* 3: 32–47.
———, 1982. "Varro's *Antiquitates rerum diuinarum* and religious affairs in the late Roman Republic." *BRL* 65: 148–205.
Johnson, Patricia J. 1997. "Ovid's Livia in exile." *CW* 90: 403–420.
———, 2008. *Ovid before Exile: Art and Punishment in the* Metamorphoses. Madison, WI.
Jolowicz, H.F. and B. Nicholas. 1972. *Historical Introduction to Roman Law*. 3rd ed. Cambridge.
Jones, A.H.M. 1960. *Studies in Roman Government and Law*. Oxford.
———, 1970. *Augustus*. London.
deJonge, T.J. 1951. *Publii Ovidii Nasonis Tristium Liber IV Commentario Exegetico Instructus*. Diss. Groningen.
Kaser, M. 1949. *Das altrömische Ius*. Göttingen.
———, 1971^2. *Das römische Privatrecht*. Vol. I. Munich.
———, 1967. *Römische Rechtsgeschichte*. 2nd ed. Göttingen.
———, 1986. "'Ius publicum' und 'ius privatum'." *ZSS* 103: 1–101.
Kaster, R.A., ed. and trans. 1995. *C. Suetonius Tranquillus. De Grammaticis et Rhetoribus*. Oxford.
Kelly, G.P. 2006. *A History of Exile in the Roman Republic*. Cambridge.
Kelly, J.M. 1957. *Princeps Iudex: Untersuchungen zur Entwicklung und zu den Grundlagen der kaiserlichen Gerichtsbarkeit*. Weimar.
Kennedy, D.F. 1992. "'Augustan' and 'Anti-Augustan': Reflections on Terms of Reference." In A. Powell, ed. 1992: 25–58.
———, 2002. "Recent receptions of Ovid." In Philip Hardie 2002b: 320–335.
Kenney, E.J. 1965a. Review of Thibault 1964. *CR* 15: 299.
———, 1965b. "The Poetry of Ovid's Exile." *PCPS* 11: 37–49.
———, 1969. "Ovid and the Law." *YCS* 21: 343–363.

——, 1982. "Ovid." *CHCL* Vol. 2: 420–457.
Kenney, E.J. and A.D. Melville, trans. 1992. *Ovid. Sorrows of an Exile*: Tristia. Oxford.
Kettemann, R. 1999. "Ovid's Verbannungsort—ein locus horribilis?" In *Werk und Wirkung*: 715–736.
Kienast, D. 1999. *Augustus: Prinzeps und Monarch.* 3rd ed. Darmstadt.
Kiessling, A. and R. Heinze. 1964. *Oden und Epoden.* 11th ed. Berlin.
Knox, P. 1995. *Ovid* Heroides. *Select Epistles.* Cambridge.
——, 2001. "Il poeta e il 'secondo' principe: Ovidio e la politica all'epoca di Tiberio." In F. Fabbrini, ed. *Maecenas. Il collezionismo nel mondo romano dall'età degli Scipioni a Cicerone.* Arezzo. 151–181. (= "The Poet and the Second Prince: Ovid in the Age of Tiberius." *MAAR* 49 (2004): 1–20.)
Korn, O. 1867. "De carminum Ovidii ex Ponto datorum compositione strophica." *RhM* 22: 201–216.
Kunkel, W. 1973^2. *Introduction to Roman Legal and Constitutional History.* Cambridge. (2nd ed. by J.M. Kelly; Germ. original, 5th ed. 1967)
Labate, M. 1988. "Elegia triste ed elegia lieta. Un caso di riconversione letteraria." *MD* 19: 91–129.
Lamacchia, R. 1969. "Sull'evoluzione semantica di *poena*." *Studia Florentina Alexandro Ronconi sexagenario oblata*: 135–154.
Lambrino, S. 1958. "Tomes cité greco-gète chez Ovide." *Ovidiana*: 379–390.
Latte, K. 1926. "Über eine Eigentümlichkeit der italischen Gottesvorstellung." *Archiv für Relgionswissenschaft* 24: 244–258. (Repr. in Latte 1968. 76–90.)
——, 1950. "Religiöse Begriffe im frührömischen Recht." *SZZ* 67: 47–61.
——, 1960. *Römische Religionsgeschichte.* Munich.
——, 1968. *Kleine Schriften.* Munich.
Lechi, F. 1978. "La palinodia del poeta elegiaco: i carmi ovidiani dell'esilio." *Atene e Roma* 23: 1–22.
——, 1988. "*Piger ad poenas, ad praemia uelox*: un modello di sovrano nelle *Epistulae ex Ponto*." *MD* 20–21: 119–132.
Lee, A.G. 1959. "The Originality of Ovid." *Atti* 2: 405–412.
Lehmann, Y. 1997. *Varron théologien et philosophe romain.* Collection Latomus, vol. 237. Brussels.
Lenz, F.W., ed. 1938. *P. Ovidii Nasonis ex Ponto Epistularum libri quattuor.* Paravia.
Levene, D.S. 1997. "God and Man in the Classical Latin Panegyric." *PCPS* 43: 66–103.
Lieberg, G. 1973. "Die 'Theologia Tripertita' in Forschung und Bezeugung." *ANRW* I. 4: 63–115.
——, 1982. *Poeta Creator. Studien zu einer Figur der antiken Dichtung.* Amsterdam.
——, 1985. "*Poeta Creator*: Some 'religious' aspects." *PLLS* 5: 23–32.
Liebeschuetz, J.H.W.G. 1979. *Continuity and Change in Roman Religion.* Oxford.
Little, D.A. 1982. "Politics in Augustan Poetry." *ANRW* 30.1: 254–370.
——, 1990. "Ovid's last poems: Cry of pain from exile or literary frolic in Rome." *Prudentia* 22: 23–39.
Lively, G. 2005. *Ovid: Love Songs.* London.
Lowrie, M. 1997. *Horace's Narrative Odes.* New York.
Lozovan, E. 1958. "Ovide et le bilingualisme." *Ovidiana*: 396–403.

——, 1959. "Réalités Pontiques et nécessités littéraires chez Ovide." *Atti*: 355–370.
——, 1990. "*Ius iniustum* chez les Gètes de Tome selon Ovide." *REL* 68:
Luck, G. 1961. "Brief und Epistel in der Antike." *Altertum* 7: 77–84.
——, ed. 1967. *P. Ovidius Naso, Tristia*. Vol. 1. Heidelberg.
——, 1977. *P. Ovidius Naso, Tristia*. Vol. 2. Heidelberg.
Lütkemeyer, S. 2005. *Ovids Exildichtung im Spannungsfeld von Ekloge und Elegie. Eine poetologisiche Deutung der* Tristia *and* Epistulae ex Ponto. Frankfurt a.M.
Mahon, Derek. 1983. *The Hunt by Night*. Winston-Salem.
Malaspina, E. 1995. *Nimia Veritas. Il vissuto quotidiano negli scritti esilici di Ovidio*. Rome.
Marache, R. 1958. "La Révolte d'Ovide exilé contre Auguste." *Ovidiana*: 412–419.
Marg, W. 1959. "Zur Behandlung des Augustus in den *Tristien*." *Atti 2*: 345–354.
Marin, D. 1958a. "Intorno alle cause dell'esilio di Ovidio." *Ovidiana*: 406–411.
——, 1958b. "Ovidio fu relegato per la sua opposizione al regime Augusteo?" *Acta Philologica* 1: 99–252.
Martin, A.J. 2004. *Was ist Exil? Ovids* Tristia *and* Epistulae ex Ponto. Hildesheim.
Martindale, C., ed. 1988. *Ovid Renewed. Ovidian Influences on Literature and Art from the Middle Ages to the Twentieth Century*. Cambridge.
Martini, E. 1933. *Einleitung zu Ovid*. Prague.
Mattingly, H.B. 1960. "Naevius and the Metelli." *Historia* 9: 414–439.
McGowan, M. (forthcoming). "Teaching Ovid from Tomis." In B. Weiden Boyd and C. Fox, eds. *Approaches to Teaching Ovid and Ovidianism*. New York.
McKeown, J.C. 1984. "Fabula proposito nulla tegenda meo: Ovid's Fasti and Augustan Politics." In A.J. Woodman and D.A. West, eds. *Poetry and Politics in the Age of Augustus*. Cambridge. 169–187.
——, 1987. *Ovid: Amores. Volume I: Text and Prolegomena*. Leeds.
——, 1989. *Ovid: Amores. Volume II: A Commentary on Book One*. Leeds.
——, 1998. *Ovid: Amores. Volume III: A Commentary on Book Two*. Leeds.
Merkel, R., ed. 1841. *P. Ouidi Nasonis Fastorum Libri VI*. Berlin.
Millar, F. 1977. *The Emperor in the Roman World 31 BC–AD 337*. Ithaca, NY.
——, 1993. "Ovid and the *Domus Augusta*: Rome seen from Tomoi." *JRS* 83: 1–17.
Miller, P.A. 2004. *Latin Love Elegy and the Emergence of the Real*. Princeton-Oxford.
Momigliano, A. 1940. Review of Syme 1939. *JRS* 30: 75–80.
——, 1942. Review of L. Robinson, *Freedom of Speech in the Roman Republic*, Diss. Johns Hopkins University, 1937. *JRS* 32: 120–124.
Mommsen, T. 1882. "Das augustische Festverzeichnis von Cumae." *Hermes* 17: 631–643.
——, 1952. *Römisches Staatsrecht*. Vols. 1 and 2. 3rd ed. Leipzig. 1887. (Repr. Tübingen)
——, 1955. *Römisches Strafrecht*. Leipzig. 1899. (Repr. Darmstadt)
Moynihan, R. 1985. "Geographical Mythology and Roman Imperial Ideology." In R. Winkes, ed. *The Age of Augustus*. Louvain. 149–162.

Mozley, J.H. 1979². *Ovid. The Art of Love and Other Poems.* 2nd ed. revised by G.P. Goold. Cambridge, Mass.-London.
Mynors, R.A.B. 1990. *Virgil. Georgics. Edited with a Commentary.* Oxford.
Nagle, B.R. 1980. *The Poetics of Exile: Program and polemic in the "Tristia" and "Epistulae ex Ponto" of Ovid.* Brussels.
Nawotka, K. 1997. *The Western Pontic Cities. History and Political Organization.* Amsterdam.
Newlands, C.E. 1995. *Playing with Time: Ovid and the Fasti.* Ithaca.
——, 1997. "The role of the book in *Tristia* 3.1." *Ramus* 26: 57–79.
Newman, J.K. 1967. *The Concept of* Vates *in Augustan Poetry.* Collection Latomus, vol. 89. Brussels
——, 2006. "[Propertius'] Third Book: Defining a Poetic Self." In H.-C. Günther, ed., *Brill's Companion to Propertius*, Leiden-Boston: 319–352.
Nicholas, B. 1962. *An Introduction to Roman Law.* Oxford.
Nicolet, C. 1991. *Space, Geography and Politics in the Early Roman Empire.* Ann Arbor.
Niebling, G. 1956. "Laribus Augustis Magistri primi. Der Beginn des Compitalkultes der Lares und des Genius Augusti." *Historia* 5: 303–331.
Nisbet, R.G.M. and M. Hubbard. 1970. *A Commentary on Horace's Odes, Book I.* Oxford.
——, 1978. *A Commentary on Horace's Odes, Book II.* Oxford.
Nisbet, R.G.M. 1982. "'Great and Lesser Bear' (Ovid, *Tristia* 4.3)." *JRS* 72: 49–56.
Nock, A.D. 1934. "Religious developments from the close of the Republic to the reign of Nero." *CAH* 10: 465–505.
Norden, E. 1913. *Agnostos Theos.* Leipzig.
——, 1957. *P. Vergilius Maro. Aeneis Buch VI.* 3rd ed. Leipzig 1926. (Repr. Stuttgart)
——, 1998. *Römische Literatur.* Leipzig. 1961⁶. (Repr. Hildesheim)
Norwood, F. 1963. "The Riddle of Ovid's *Relegatio.*" *CP* 58: 150–163.
Nugent, S.G. 1990. "*Tristia* 2: Ovid and Augustus." In K.A. Raaflaub and M. Toher, eds. *Between Republic and Empire: Interpretations of Augustus and His Principate.* Berkeley. 239–257.
O'Gorman, E. 1997. "Love and the Family: Augustus and Ovidian Elegy." *Arethusa* 30: 103–123.
Oliensis, E. 1997. "Return to Sender: The Rhetoric of *Nomina* in Ovid's exile poetry." *Ramus* 26: 172–193.
——, 2004. "The Power of Image-Makers: Representation and Revenge in Ovid *Metamorphoses* 6 and *Tristia* 4." *CA* 23: 285–321.
Otis, B. 1970². *Ovid as an Epic Poet.* Cambridge.
Otto, A. 1890. *Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer.* Leipzig.
Owen, S.G. 1902. *Ovid's* Tristia *Book 1.* 3rd ed. Oxford. (1st ed. 1885)
——, ed. 1915. *P. Ovidii Nasonis Tristium Libri Quinque, Ibis, Ex Ponto Libri Quattuor, Halieutica, Fragmenta.* Oxford.
——, 1924. *P. Ovidi Nasonis Tristium Liber Secundus.* Oxford. (Repr. Amsterdam 1967)
Peter, H. 1901. *Der Brief in der römischen Literatur.* Leipzig.

Pfeiffer, R. 1976. *History of Classical Scholarship from 1300–1850*. Vol. 2. Oxford.
Pippidi, D.M. 1977. "Tomis, cité géto-grecque à l'époque d'Ovide?" *Athenaeum* 55: 250–256.
Podossinov, A.V. 1987. *Ovids Dichtung als Quelle für die Geschichte des Schwarzmeergebiets*. Xenia: Konstanzer Althistorische Vorträge und Forschungen 19. Konstanz.
Pohlenz, M. 1913. "Die Abfassungszeit von Ovids Metamorphosen." *Hermes* 48: 1–13.
Possanza, M.D. 2004. *Translating the Heavens: Aratus, Germanicus, and the Poetics of Latin Translation*. New York-Frankfurt a.M.
Powell, A, ed. 1992. *Roman Poetry and Propaganda in the Age of Augustus*. London.
Price, S.R.F. 1980. "Between Man and God: Sacrifice in the Roman Imperial Cult." *JRS* 70: 28–43.
——, 1984a. *Rituals and Power: The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor*. Cambridge.
——, 1984b. "Gods and Emperors: The Greek Language of the Roman Imperial Cult." *JHS* 104: 79–95.
Raaflaub, K.A. and L.J. Samons. 1990. "Opposition to Augustus." In K.A. Raaflaub and M. Toher, eds. *Between Republic and Empire: Interpretations of Augustus and His Principate*. Berkeley: 417–454.
Rahn, H. 1958. "Ovids elegische Epistel." *Antike und Abendland* 7: 105–120. (Repr. in vonAlbrecht & Zinn 1968: 476–501.)
Ramsey, J.T. 2003. *Cicero. Philippics I–II*. Cambridge.
Rawson, E. 1985. *Intellectual Life in the Late Roman Republic*. Baltimore.
Richmond, J.A., ed. 1990. *P. Ouidii Nasonis ex Ponto Libri Quattuor*. Leipzig.
——, 2002. "Manuscript Traditions and the Transmission of Ovid's Works." In B. Weiden Boyd 2002: 443–483.
Rives, J.B. 1998. "Roman Religion Revived." (Review of M. Beard, J. North, and S.R.F. Price 1998 and Small 1996.) *Phoenix* 52: 345–365.
Rosati, G. 1979. "L'esistenza letteraria. Ovidio e l'autocoscienza della poesia." *MD* 2: 101–136.
——, 1983. *Narciso e Pigmalione, illusione e spettacolo nelle* Metamorfosi *di Ovidio*. Florence.
Rosenmeyer, P. 1997. "Ovid's Heroides and Tristia: Voices from Exile." *Ramus* 26: 29–56.
——, 2001. *Ancient Epistolary Fictions: The letter in Greek literature*. Cambridge.
Rosiello, F. 2002. "Semantica di *error* in Ovidio." *Bollettino di Studi Latini* 32: 424–462.
Rösler, W. 1980. "Die Entdeckung der Fiktionalität in der Antike." *Poetica* 12: 283–319.
Rüpke, J. 2005. "Varro's tria genera theologiae: religious thinking in the late Republic." *Ordia prima* 4: 107–129.
Russo, J., M. Fernandez-Galliano and A. Heubeck. 1992. *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey*. Vol. III: Books XVII–XXIV. Oxford.
Said, E.W. 2000. "Reflections on Exile." In *Reflections on Exile and Other Essays*. Cambridge, MA. 173–186. (Orig. published in *Granta* 13 [1984] 157–172)
Scheid, J. 1992. "Myth, cult and reality in Ovid's Fasti" *PCPS* n.s. 38:118–131.

———, 1993. "Cultes, mythes et politique au début de l'Empire." In F. Graf, ed. *Mythos in mythenloser Gesellschaft. Das Paradigma Roms.* Stuttgart-Leipzig. 109–127.
Scholte, A. 1933. *Publii Ovidii Nasonis ex Ponto Liber Primus commentario exegetico instructus.* Diss. Amersfurt.
Scott, K. 1930. "Emperor Worship in Ovid." *TAPA* 61: 43–69.
Scullard, H.H. 1980. *Festivals and Ceremonies of the Roman Republic.* London.
Shackleton Bailey, D.R. 1982. "Notes on Ovid's poems from exile." *CQ* 32: 390–398.
Skutsch, O. 1985. *The Annals of Quintus Ennius.* Oxford.
Slavitt, D.R., trans. 1990. *Ovid's Poetry of Exile.* Baltimore-London.
Small, A., ed. 1996. *Subject and Rule: The Cult of the Ruling Power in Classical Antiquity.* Ann Arbor.
Smolak, K. 1980. "Der verbannte Dichter. Identifizierung mit Ovid in Mittelalter und Neuzeit." *WS* NF 14: 158–191.
Solodow, J.B. 1988. *The World of Ovid's* Metamorphoses. Chapel Hill, NC.
Stahl, H.-P. 2002. "Sneaking it by the Emperor: Ovid playing it both ways." In B. Amden et al., eds. *Noctes Atticae. Studies Presented to Jorgen Mejer on his Sixtieth Birthday, March 18, 2002.* Copenhagen. 265–280.
Stanford, W.B. 1963. *The Ulysses Theme.* Cambridge.
Strachan-Davidson, J.L. 1969. *Problems of the Roman Criminal Law.* 2 vols. Oxford. (Repr. Amsterdam orig. 1912)
Stroh, W. 1969. *Ovid im Urteil der Nachwelt. Eine Testimoniensammlung.* Darmstadt.
———, 1971. *Die römische Liebeselegie als werbende Dichtung.* Amsterdam.
———, 1981. "Tröstende Musen: zur literarhistorischen Stellung und Bedeutung von Ovids Exilgedichten." *ANRW* II 31.4: 2639–2684.
Sykutris, J. 1931. "Epistolographie." *RE Suppl.* VI: 185–220.
Syme, R. 1934. "Lentulus and the origin of Moesia." *JRS* 24:113–137.
———, 1939. *The Roman Revolution.* Oxford.
———, 1978. *History in Ovid.* Oxford.
Taplin, O. 2002. "Contemporary poetry and Classics." In T.P. Wiseman, ed. *Classics in Progress: Essays on ancient Greece and Rome.* Oxford. 1–19.
Tarrant, R.J. 1983. "Epistulae ex Ponto" and "Tristia." In L.D. Reynolds, ed. *Texts and Transmission.* Oxford. 262–265; 282–284.
———, 2002. "Ovid and ancient literary history." In P. Hardie 2002b: 13–33.
Tarver, T. 1996. "Varro, Caesar, and the Roman Calendar." In A.H. Sommerstein, ed. *Religion and Superstition in Latin Literature.* Bari. 39–57.
Taylor, L.R. 1931. *The Divinity of the Roman Emperor.* Middletown, CN.
Tellegen-Couperus, O.E. 1993. *A Short History of Roman Law.* London-New York. (Revised English language ed. of Dutch original, 1990.)
Thibault, J.C. 1964. *The Mystery of Ovid's Exile.* Berkeley-Los Angeles.
Thomas, R.F. 1988. *Virgil: Georgics* I–II, III–IV. 2 vols. Cambridge.
Thraede, K. 1970. *Grundzüge griechisch-römischer Brieftopik* (*Zetemata* 48). Munich.
———, 1973. "Die Poesie und der Kaiserkult." In W. den Boer, ed. *Le culte des souverains dans l'empire romain.* Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique. Tome XIX. Bern. 273–303.
Tolkiehn, J. 1900. *Homer und die römische Poesie.* Leipzig.

Tomaschek, W. 1894. "Die alten Thraker, II." *Sitzungsberichte der Wiener Akadamie* 131: 20.

Turcan, R. 1998. *Rome et ses dieux*. Paris.

Verdière, R. 1992. *Le Secret du Voltigeur d'Amour ou le Mystère de la Relégation d'Ovide*. Brussels.

Veyne, P. 1988. *Roman Erotic Elegy: Love, Poetry, and the West*. Chicago.

——, 1989. "S'assoeir auprès des dieux, fréquenter les temples: la nouvelle piété sous l'Empire." *Revue de Philologie* 63: 175–194.

Viarre, S. 1988. "Les aspects mythiques du pays d'exil dans les *Tristes* et les *Pontiques* d'Ovide." *Peuple et pays mythiques, Actes du Ve Colloque du Centre de Recherches Mythologiques de l'Université de Paris X*. (Chantilly, 18–20, septembre 1986) Paris. 149–158.

——, 1991. "Les Muses de l'exil ou les métamorphoses de la mémoire." In G. Papponetti, ed. *Ovidio, poeta della memoria*. Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi, Sulmona, 19–21 ottobre 1989. Rome. 114–141.

——, 1999. "La passion d'Ovide pour la poésie dans les poèmes de l'exil." In *Werk und Wirkung*: 701–714.

——, 2002. "La lettre à double destinataire: Ovide, Pontiques IV, 8." In *Epistulae Antiquae. Actes du Ier colloque: Le genre épistolaire antique et ses prolongements*. Paris: Peeters: 189–201.

Videau-Delibes, A. 1991. *Les* Tristes *d'Ovide et l'élégie romaine*. Paris.

Walker, A.D. and G.D. Williams, eds. 1997. *Ovid and Exile. Ramus* 26. Vols. 1 & 2. Critical Studies in Greek and Roman Literature.

Walker, A.D. 1997. "Oedipal Narratives and the exilic Ovid." *Ramus* 26: 194–204.

Wallace-Hadrill, A. 1982. "*Civilis princeps*: Between Citizen and King." *JRS* 72: 32–48.

——, 1987. "Time for Augustus: Ovid, Augustus and the *Fasti*." In M. Whitby and P. Hardie, eds. *Homo Viator: Classical Essays for John Bramble*. Bristol. 221–230.

——, 1990. "Roman Arches and Greek Honours: The Language of Power at Rome." *PCPS* 36: 143–181.

Watkins, C. 1977. "À propos de MHNIS." *BSL* 72: 187–210.

Watson, A. 1992. *The State, Law and Religion*. Athens, GA.

Watson, P. 2002. "*Praecepta Amoris*: Ovid's Didactic Elegy." In B. Weiden Boyd 2002: 141–165.

Weiden Boyd, B, ed. 2002. *Brill's Companion to Ovid*. Leiden-Boston-Köln.

Weinstock, S. 1971. *Divus Julius*. Oxford.

West, M.L. 1974. *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus*. Berlin.

Wheeler, A.L., ed. and trans. 1988[2]. *Ovid: Tristia and Epistulae ex Ponto*. 2nd ed., revised by G.P. Goold. Cambridge, MA.

White, P. 2002. "Ovid and the Augustan Milieu." In B. Weiden Boyd 2002: 1–25.

Wiedemann, T. 1975. "The political background to Ovid's Tristia 2." *CQ* 25: 264–271.

von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. 1926. "Lesefrüchte (Auszug)." *Hermes* 61: 298–302. (Repr. in von Albrecht 1968: 471–475.)

Wilkes, J.J. 1996. "The Danubian and Balkan Provinces." *CAH*² X: 545–585.
Wilkinson, L.P. 1955. *Ovid Recalled*. Cambridge.
———, 1965. Review of Thibault 1964. *Gnomon* 37: 734–735.
Williams, Gareth D. 1994. *Banished Voices: Readings in Ovid's Exile Poetry*. Cambridge.
———, 1996. *The Curse of Exile. A study of Ovid's* Ibis. Cambridge.
———, 2002a. "Ovid's exile poetry: *Tristia, Epistulae ex Ponto and Ibis*." In P. Hardie 2002b: 233–245.
———, 2002b. "Ovid's Exilic Poetry: Worlds Apart." In B. Weiden Boyd 2002: 337–381.
Williams, Gordon. 1969. *The Third Book of Horace's* Odes. Oxford.
———, 1978. *Change and Decline: Roman Literature in the Early Empire*. Sather Classical Lectures 45. Berkeley-Los Angeles.
Willis, J. 1972. *Latin Textual Criticism*. Urbana, IL.
Wirszubski, C. 1950. Libertas *as a political idea at Rome during the late republic and the early principate*. Cambridge.
Wissowa, G. 1912. *Religion und Kultus der Römer*. 2nd ed. Munich.
Womersley, D., ed. 1994. Edward Gibbon. *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*. Vol. 1–2. London.
Woodman, A.J. 1983. *Velleius Paterculus. The Caesarian and Augustan Narrative* (2.41–93). Cambridge.
Zingerle, A. 1869–1871. *Untersuchungen über Ovidius und sein Verhältnis zu den Vorgängern*. Innsbruck.
Ziolkowski, T. 2005. *Ovid and the Moderns*. Ithaca, NY.

INDEX LOCORUM

ALCMAN

148 (Davies) 112n61

ANTHOLOGIA PALATINA

6.222 22n25
11.44 22n25

APPIAN

Bellum Civile
5.132 87n73, 100n29

ARISTOTLE

Poetics
1451^{b}4–15 33n60, 181

Politics
8.3.4 187n44

ARNOBIUS

Adversus Nationes
4.34 47n39

AUGUSTINE

De Civitate Dei
2.9 47
3.4 76n49, 95
6.2 108
6.3 107n51
6.5 109, 188
6.6 110n58, 111
6.6–9 116
7.35 95n7

AUGUSTUS

Res Gestae (sive Monumentum Ancyrum)
8.5 108n54
30–31 147
35 73n40

AULUS GELLIUS

Noctes Atticae
3.3.15 47n40
7.8.5 48n41

CATULLUS

35 22
65 22
68 22

CICERO

Ad Atticum
3.7.2 12n44
7.20.2 195n74

Ad Familiares
14.4.3 12n44

De Inventione
2.162 134n31

De Legibus
1.1.1–5 32n56
1.1.4 32
1.1.5 32n60

De Re Publica
2.7 4n14
4.11–12 47
6.13 76n49
6.19 76n49

In Verrem
1.29 48n41
4.73 195n74

Partitiones Oratoriae
129 134n31

Philippicae
2.110 99n27

(Cicero, cont.)

Post Reditum in Senatu
8 76n49

Pro Marcello
8 76n49
13 44n28

Pro Milone
101 4n14

Pro Sestio
29–30 46n35

Tusculanae Disputationes
5.38 124n7

CIL (*Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*)

Fast. Praen.
CIL I² 233 73n40
I² 753 101n37
III 14147⁵ 45n32
V 4087 101n37
VI.2 9632.3–2 166n94
IX 2628 99n27
X 3757 100n33

Dio Cassius

47.18.4 99n27
47.19.2 99n27
53.16.8 103n43
54.16.3 69
55.22–34 17n2
56.16.4 206n10
56.25.6 99n23
56.26.1 37n1, 156n74
56.27.1 45n33
56.42.3 155n71
57.20.3–4 18n8

Ennius

Annales (ed. Skutsch)
2–10 171n8
12 112n61
469–470 176n23
492 72

Festus, Sex. Pompeius

p. 181M 47n39

Gaius

Institutiones
1.67 42n22

Germanicus

Phaenomena
1–2 155n72
145–146 114n64
558–560 155n72

Epigrammata
Anth. Lat. (ed. Riese)
607–608 155n72

Herodotus

4.28 209n19
4.116–117 147

Hesiod

Theogony
38 32
47 72n39
457 72n39
468 72n39

Homer

Iliad
1.181 194n70
1.192 194n70
1.544 72n39
2.488–490 175
3.200–202 198n81
6.357–358 182
8.5–27 81
9.189 165
10.314–315 188n49
16.386–388 192n59
22.401 174n18
24.527–533 191
24.527–534 78n55

24.532–533 191n56
sch. ad 1.1 192n62, 194n70

Odyssey
1.32–43 192n59
1.58 188
5.308–312 188
8.461–462 185n40
9.19–20 197
10.174–177 189n54
10.552–560 188n49
11.13–22 187n
11.167 187
11.440–461 66
12.208–221 189n54
14.83–84 192n59
18.275 192n59
20.18 189n54

Homeric Hymns

Apollo
166–176 112n61

Horace

Ars Poetica
333–344 33n61, 200n89
408–418 199n85

Carmina
1.2.41–52 65n12
1.12 72
1.12.1–2 76
1.12.49–52 72
1.12.49–60 65n12, 67n22
1.12.57–60 72
2.20 112n61
2.20.1–5 82n64
2.20.13–20 82n64
3.3.9–12 65n12
3.5.1 77
3.5.1–4 65n12, 67n22, 72, 76
3.6.1–4 100n33
3.14.1–4 65n12
3.14.5 69n29
3.25.3–6 66n12
3.30 112n61
4.1 74n45
4.2.37–39 66n12
4.3 112n61
4.5 66n12
4.5.31–36 92n81
4.9.25–28 165

Epistulae
2.1 66n12
2.1.3–4 87n74
2.1.4–14 88
2.1.15–17 77n52, 87
2.1.50–51 171
2.1.51 171n8
2.1.119–138 127n19, 163n92
2.1.145 47n39
2.1.152–153 47n39
2.1.156–157 47n39

Sermones
2.5.3 198n82

Isidore

Origines
5.2.2 123n5

Jerome

Chronicon
135 47n40

Lactantius

Institutiones
1.6.7 95n7

Livius Andronicus

Odusia (ed. Morel)
fr. 1 106n48

Livy

4.20.7 100n33
5.49.7 73
6.39.7 80n61
7.1.10 73

Lucan

Bellum Civile
9.980–986 166n96

Lucilius (ed. Marx)

fr. 181–188 22
fr. 341 22

Lucretius

De Rerum Natura
2.1–19 151n64

Macrobius

6.3.6 176n21

Manilius

1.7 73n41
1.9 66n14
1.899–900 66n14

Martial

Epigrammata
1.105.1 169n1
7.44.1 169n1

Neratius

Digesta
41.10.5.1 42n22

Ovid

Amores
1.1.6 114n64
1.1.7–16 73n42
1.15 112n61, 204n2
1.15.7–8 28n42
1.15.14 199n85
1.15.41–42 28n42
2.13.27 125n11
3.9.5 153n66
3.9.17 153n66
3.9.26 153n66
3.9.29 153n66
3.9.41 153n66
3.11.19–20 131
3.12.19 180n31
3.12.21–40 73n42
3.12.41–42 32, 180n31

Ars Amatoria
1.177–228 18n8
1.204 72n38
1.433–436 176
1.631–658 94
1.637 95n8
1.637–638 94
1.638 96n9
1.647–658 195n74
1.739 125n12
2.113–128 207
2.744 170n3
3.151 125n12
3.346 22
3.812 170n3

Epistulae ex Ponto
1.1.15–19 6
1.1.22 134n31
1.1.36 73n41
1.1.43–46 120n72
1.1.55–56 120n72
1.1.57–60 58n82
1.1.61–64 59, 120
1.1.63 83
1.1.66 43n25
1.2.11–12 59n83
1.2.28 12n44
1.2.57–58 188n52
1.2.61 103n44
1.2.71 194n72
1.2.71–74 74
1.2.87–88 75, 194n72
1.2.97 83
1.2.97–98 141n41
1.2.99 141
1.2.115–118 75
1.2.121–136 75n48
1.2.144 54n71
1.2.147–150 75n47
1.2.148 136n33
1.3 184n39
1.3.15 45n31

1.3.33–34 188
1.3.49–50 27n38
1.3.61–84 52n64
1.4.9–10 177n26, 190n55
1.4.29 193n66
1.4.29–30 206
1.4.55 69n29
1.4.55–56 70n34, 83, 103
1.5.44 200
1.5.54–55 198n84
1.5.85–86 12n44
1.6.19–20 50n55
1.6.19–26 42n20
1.6.21 43n25
1.6.21–22 54n71
1.6.25 43n27, 44n29
1.6.25–26 43n26
1.6.26 44n29, 62
1.6.39–44 151n63
1.7.9–10 12n44
1.7.39–40 43n26, 53n70
1.7.39–42 42n20
1.7.40 44n29
1.7.41 43n23, 43n25
1.7.44 43n25
1.7.51 194n71
1.7.60 136n33
1.8.27 12n44, 187
1.8.27–28 81n62
1.8.69–70 143
1.9.3 129n24
1.9.17–18 166n95
1.9.21–22 151n63
1.9.41 136n33
1.9.43 136n33
2.1.17–18 158
2.1.18 23, 50n56
2.1.19 158
2.1.23–24 134n30
2.1.49 156, 157n76, 158
2.1.55–56 157
2.1.57–58 157n77
2.1.62 157
2.1.63–68 158n79
2.1.81–82 78n57
2.2.15 43n26
2.2.15–16 44n27, 129n24
2.2.19–20 136n33
2.2.26 194n71
2.2.59 54n71
2.2.83–84 71
2.2.94 209n20
2.2.105 43n25
2.2.108 70
2.3.3 12n44
2.3.3–4 166n95
2.3.33 43n25
2.3.41–42 194n73
2.3.43–44 194n73
2.3.45–46 194n73
2.3.46 43n26
2.3.61–62 143n44
2.3.84 38n5
2.3.86 43n26
2.3.91–92 42n20
2.4.21 146n52
2.5.21 161
2.5.26 161
2.5.41–56 161n86
2.5.44 161
2.5.47–54 71n36
2.5.57–58 161
2.5.59–60 161
2.5.63–66 199
2.5.71 136n33
2.5.71–72 154n68, 161
2.5.75–76 162n88
2.6.5 43n25
2.6.7 43n26
2.6.18 70n33
2.6.33–34 204n4, 213n28
2.7.33–34 172n14, 190
2.7.34 169
2.7.51 43n26
2.7.55 119n71
2.7.60 184n39, 185n39
2.7.66 19, 121n1
2.8.1–4 69
2.8.5–6 70n31
2.8.7–8 70n32
2.8.9–10 88
2.8.13–16 88
2.8.15–16 70n32
2.8.17–18 89

(Ovid, *Epistulae ex Ponto*, cont.)

2.8.19–20 89
2.8.23–24 143n44
2.8.30 46n36
2.8.37 126n16
2.8.37–38 70n32
2.8.51–52 70n32
2.8.51–76 90
2.8.61–62 70n32
2.8.67 78, 92
2.8.75–76 143n44
2.9.41 185n40
2.9.43–44 195n74
2.9.67 46n36
2.9.67–71 42n20
2.9.71 46n36, 134n31
2.9.73–74 54n71
2.9.75 43n25
2.9.75–76 20n16
2.9.76 43n26
2.10.17–18 154
3.1.35–36 184n39
3.1.105–114 183n35
3.1.117–118 68
3.1.135 103n44
3.1.145 68
3.1.147 54n71
3.1.156 46n36
3.2 194n73
3.2.29–30 182n34, 204n4, 213n28
3.2.33 194n73
3.2.40 147
3.3.31–32 184n38
3.3.56–57 134n31
3.3.68 83n65
3.3.71–76 53n71
3.3.72–76 42n20
3.3.74 43n26
3.4.15–16 137
3.4.17 159
3.4.19–20 159
3.4.33–34 14n49
3.4.38 136n33
3.4.65 154
3.4.67 154
3.4.83–86 160
3.4.89–90 160
3.4.95–112 86n70
3.5.4 140n40
3.5.21 43n25
3.6.9–10 62n89
3.6.13 44n29
3.6.19–20 179n27, 184n39
3.6.23–24 119n71
3.6.41 136n33
3.6.41–42 195n74
3.7.3–4 6n23
3.7.13–14 189
3.9.1–2 6n23
3.9.6 43n25
3.9.7 43n23, 43n25
3.9.11–14 42n20
3.9.19–20 199n87
3.9.39–42 6n23
3.9.46 181n33
3.9.47–50 180n31
3.9.47–56 14n49
3.9.55–56 34n63, 181n33
4.1.2 59n84, 64n6, 185n40
4.1.5–6 42n20, 43n26
4.1.6 43n25
4.2.21–22 184
4.2.25 154n68
4.2.29–32 34n63
4.2.39–40 34n63, 200n91
4.2.49 145n50, 154n68
4.3 4n12, 49n48
4.3.21 193n69
4.3.21–24 143n44
4.5.23 103n44
4.5.31 59n84
4.5.31–32 59n84, 203n1
4.6.5 209n18
4.6.15 43n26, 103n44
4.6.17 26n35
4.6.17–18 26n35, 106n48, 114
4.6.19–20 103n44, 153n65
4.6.33 134n31
4.7.1–2 134

4.7.53–54 182n34, 204n4, 213n28
4.8 10, 31
4.8.1 112
4.8.9 136n33
4.8.23 112
4.8.25–30 112
4.8.26 115
4.8.29–30 115
4.8.31–34 112
4.8.31–88 86n70
4.8.39–44 112
4.8.43–54 27n36
4.8.44 112n61
4.8.49–50 112
4.8.51–54 113
4.8.51–64 73n42
4.8.55 112, 113, 126n16
4.8.55–64 25
4.8.56 46n36
4.8.57 113
4.8.63 162
4.8.63–64 111n60, 113
4.8.65–66 114
4.8.67 26
4.8.67–68 71n37
4.8.69–70 114n64
4.8.73–78 114
4.8.75–78 71
4.8.76 145n50, 154n68
4.8.81 114, 154n68
4.8.81–88 27n38
4.8.87 162n87
4.8.90 112
4.9.29–32 104
4.9.35–36 138
4.9.36–42 1
4.9.39–44 138
4.9.51–54 104
4.9.68 46n36
4.9.70 103n44
4.9.74 12n44
4.9.93b–94 135
4.9.94 134n31
4.9.105–106 93
4.9.105–110 70n31
4.9.105–118 24n30, 104
4.9.105–134 86n70
4.9.107–108 70
4.9.125–134 106
4.9.127–128 156n72
4.9.131–132 26n35, 114
4.10.1 186
4.10.9–30 185
4.10.9–38 184n39
4.10.71–72 194n73
4.11.18 129n24
4.12.5 134n31
4.12.20 146n52
4.13 33n60
4.13.17–18 199
4.13.17–42 106n48
4.13.18 159
4.13.23–24 26n35
4.13.25 103n44
4.13.25–26 155n71
4.13.29–30 69n28
4.13.33 106n48
4.13.41–42 34n63
4.13.43 155
4.14.16 193n69
4.14.23 43n26
4.14.35–36 184n39
4.14.37–42 49n48
4.14.41 193n69
4.14.41–42 56n78
4.14.44 49n48
4.14.54 134n31
4.15.2 20n15
4.15.3 70n33
4.15.3–4 6n21, 59n84, 64n6, 203n1
4.15.5–6 176n21
4.15.12 134n31
4.16.10 18n8
4.16.13–14 184n39
4.16.45 126n16, 162n89
4.16.49–50 61

Fasti
1.7 162n90
1.13–14 163n91
1.14 162n90

(Ovid, *Fasti*, cont.)
1.25 26, 126n16, 126n17, 143n45
1.45 124n7
1.285–286 157n77
1.329 126n17
1.329–330 130n26
1.333 162n90
1.348 162n90
1.531–534 7n28, 112n60
1.532 126n17
1.608 72n38
1.618 162n90
1.627 162n90
1.629 126n17
1.649–650 69n28
1.650 72n38
1.660 162n90
2.59–66 100n33
2.119–120 176
2.131–132 72
2.683–684 208
3.421–422 72n38
3.713–790 144n46
3.714 146n51
6.3–8 126
6.7–8 163
6.21–26 69n28
6.253–256 126n18

Heroides
3.5–6 125n12
3.153–154 128n23
4.134 125n12
16 23
18 23
20 23
20.149–151 41n17

Ibis
11–12 42n20
23–24 83n65
36 193n69
95–97 153n65
107–112 191n56
243–247 160
86 193n69
139 193n69
413 193n69
577 193n69
616 134n31

Metamorphoses
1.3–4 31
1.4 57
1.5–162 31, 113n63
2.377–378 126n15
3.141–142 195n78
3.175 195n78
3.192–193 196
3.230–231 196
8.533–534 176
9.136–137 113n63
9.409 4n14
10.230–234 212n26
10.252 14
13.59–60 198n82
13.123–398 201n92
13.323 201n93
15.211 28n41
15.413 113n63
15.746 65n9
15.799–851 31
15.832–837 141
15.843 ff. 26n35
15.855–860 73
15.858 67n18
15.867 126
15.868–870 79
15.871–879 12, 112n61, 126n15, 204n2
15.878 213
15.878–879 32n57, 181, 212

Remedia Amoris
71–72 170n3
558 170n3

Tristia
1.1.1 173n17
1.1.1–2 3, 3n7, 214
1.1.3 3, 51n58
1.1.17–24 55
1.1.20 6, 59, 64n6
1.1.23 55n76

1.1.23–24 53n70
1.1.24 39n11
1.1.25–26 56
1.1.35–36 14n49
1.1.35–50 199n87
1.1.47–48 22n24, 172, 201n93
1.1.49–54 191n58
1.1.56 140
1.1.67–68 20n16, 58n82
1.1.71–72 80
1.1.81 145
1.1.81–82 36, 80, 119n71
1.1.100 194n71
1.1.114 177n24, 197n80
1.1.117–122 214
1.2.5–10 73n42
1.2.9–10 177n25
1.2.59 129
1.2.59–106 42
1.2.61–64 203n1
1.2.64 38n4, 39n11, 59, 128
1.2.65–66 81
1.2.72 12n44
1.2.95–96 58
1.2.95–106 127
1.2.96 43n25, 55n76, 57n80, 128
1.2.97–100 42
1.2.98 43, 43n27
1.2.98–99 43n26
1.2.99–100 42n20, 50n55
1.2.102 103n44
1.2.103–104 102
1.2.104 70n33, 129
1.2.108 193n69
1.3 51n61
1.3.21–22 166n95
1.3.22 12n44
1.3.23–24 174n18
1.3.25–26 173, 174n19
1.3.36 42n20
1.3.38 43n26, 43n27, 44n29
1.3.61 209n18
1.3.89 166n95
1.3.93–94 174n18
1.3.99 151n63
1.5.6 151n63
1.5.19–20 194n73
1.5.21–22 194n73
1.5.23–24 194n73
1.5.31–32 175n20
1.5.45–52 53
1.5.53–56 176
1.5.57–58 22n24, 177, 195n76
1.5.59–84 178
1.5.70 63
1.5.78 11n41
1.5.79–80 175n20
1.6 170n6
1.6.19–20 182
1.6.21 144, 183
1.6.21–22 182
1.6.26 44n27
1.6.28 174n19
1.6.31–32 173n15
1.6.35–36 182, 204n4, 213n28
1.7.8 20n15, 51n57
1.7.21 57, 58n81
1.7.25–26 182n34
1.7.35–40 199n87, 215n31
1.8 4n12, 49n48, 185n40, 207n12
1.8.14 166n95
1.8.49 43n25
1.9.27–28 194n73
1.9.29–30 194n73
1.9.31–32 194n73
1.9.33–34 194n73
1.9.63–64 42n20, 57n80
1.11.11–12 166n94
1.11.35–36 199
1.11.35–44 14n49
2.1–14 33n63, 200n91
2.3 55n76, 57n80, 58n81
2.9 55n76, 57n80
2.13 136n33
2.19–20 194n71
2.19–22 33

(Ovid, *Tristia*, cont.)
2.29 59n83, 143
2.31 43n25
2.37–38 72n39, 136n33
2.37–40 74
2.51 46, 46n36
2.53–54 87
2.55 76
2.57 79
2.57–60 102
2.103 195n77
2.103–110 196
2.104 43n26
2.105–106 195
2.108 195n76
2.129–130 59n84, 64n6, 203n1
2.129–138 42n20
2.131–138 24n30, 37
2.132 128n23
2.137 20n15, 40, 51n57
2.161–164 69n28
2.173–176 70n33
2.181 73n41
2.181–186 86n71
2.187–194 52
2.199 133
2.199–200 18
2.205–206 129n25
2.207 20, 38, 43n25, 57n80
2.207–208 20n16
2.208 43n26
2.208–209 39n7
2.208–210 196
2.211–212 38, 46, 49, 124
2.212 20n16
2.213–214 130n26
2.229–230 70n33
2.233–234 134n31
2.233–236 87n74
2.237–238 136
2.237–578 212n26
2.240 38, 49
2.241–242 88n75
2.243 134n31
2.257–258 117n68
2.275–276 117n68
2.287–288 117
2.295 117
2.307 44n29
2.315 43n25, 43n26
2.335 113n63
2.337–338 129n24
2.345–346 124
2.345–347 20n16
2.353–356 34
2.355 180
2.357–358 33n62
2.361–362 49n50
2.371–380 184n36
2.421–496 205n6
2.424 198
2.447–464 49
2.463–464 49n49
2.488 134n31
2.493–494 58n82
2.495–496 205n6
2.508 103n44
2.509 125
2.510 46n36
2.515–516 125
2.525–526 193n69
2.526 44n29
2.539 43n25
2.539–546 20n16, 49n51
2.540 43n26
2.549–552 94
2.563–564 49
2.567–568 48n46
2.573–577 79
2.573–578 86n71
2.578 43n23, 43n25
3.1.17–18 14n49, 199n87
3.1.51–52 59n83
3.1.52 44n29
3.1.53–54 119n71
3.1.59–82 46
3.1.77–82 130, 162n89
3.1.78 194
3.1.81 126n16
3.2.1–2 209n18
3.2.5–6 58n81

3.2.27–28	83n65
3.3.33–34	61n86, 188n52
3.3.35–36	146n52
3.3.45–46	139n39, 188n52
3.3.73–74	139, 198
3.3.73–76	12n44, 13n45, 166n94
3.3.77–78	204n4, 213n28
3.4	194n71
3.4a.19–20	187
3.4a.19–30	73n42
3.4a.27–28	188n49
3.4a.45–46	182n34, 204n4, 213n28
3.5.27–28	162n89
3.5.37–38	194n71
3.5.45	46n36
3.5.45–50	46
3.5.47–48	49
3.5.49–50	195n77
3.5.50	43n25
3.5.51	43n27
3.5.51–52	42n20, 43n26
3.6.25	44n29
3.6.25–26	42n20
3.6.28	195n77
3.6.32	54n71
3.6.33–34	43n25
3.6.34	46n36
3.6.35	42n20
3.7	39n10
3.7.9	58n81
3.7.20	144
3.7.32	154n68
3.7.42	188
3.7.45–54	126n15, 212
3.7.47–48	121, 139
3.7.49–54	204n4
3.7.54	213
3.8.1–16	82
3.8.13	103n44
3.8.39–42	61n86, 151n63
3.9	51n63
3.9.33–34	164n93
3.10.2	182n34
3.10.78	140
3.11	4n12, 49n48, 185n40, 207n12
3.11.25–26	12n44
3.11.33–36	42n20
3.11.34	44n29
3.11.51–52	195n74
3.11.59–62	179
3.11.61–62	11n41, 184n39
3.11.65	43n26
3.12.41–42	130n26
3.12.51	208n16
3.12.53–54	86n71
3.14.5–8	46
3.14.7	144
3.14.7–8	144n48
3.14.20	12n44
3.14.23–24	182n34
3.14.25–26	14n49, 199n87
3.14.33–34	199n86
3.14.45–46	149n58
3.14.46–50	147n53, 159
3.14.51–52	180n31, 200n90, 210n21
4.1.1	14n49
4.1.1–2	180n31, 199n87, 200n90, 210n21
4.1.3–4	191n58
4.1.15–16	194n72
4.1.19	128n23
4.1.23–24	42n20
4.1.24	44n29
4.1.26	58
4.1.27–29	153n65
4.1.31	186n42
4.1.35–36	140n40
4.1.35–39	200n91
4.1.35–40	34n63
4.1.53–54	83n65
4.1.67–68	58
4.1.87–88	145n50, 153n65
4.2.1	70n33
4.2.8	70n33
4.2.55–62	137
4.3	35n66
4.3.37–38	13n46, 203
4.3.63–70	73n42
4.3.75–76	189
4.4.9–20	141

(Ovid, *Tristia*, cont.)

4.4.10 43n26
4.4.13 73n41
4.4.15 17
4.4.17–18 144
4.4.19–20 77
4.4.20 79
4.4.37 43n26, 43n27, 44n29
4.4.43 136n33
4.4.43–44 42n20, 50n55
4.4.44 43n25, 44n29
4.4.45–46 59n84, 64n6, 203n1
4.4.53 103n44
4.4.87–88 79
4.5.7–8 42n20, 51n61
4.5.21–22 81n62, 187n47
4.6.49–50 188n52
4.7.9 185n40
4.8.1 13n48
4.8.39 43n23, 43n25
4.8.52 76
4.9 4n12, 49n48, 207n12
4.9.1 44n29
4.9.9 19n12, 121n1
4.9.11 136
4.9.11–12 42n20, 51n61
4.9.17 209n18
4.9.19–26 204n4, 213n28
4.10 28
4.10.1–2 212n26
4.10.2 13, 40, 151, 204n4, 213n28
4.10.19 145n50, 154n68
4.10.21–22 184n37
4.10.42 144
4.10.45–46 155n70
4.10.59–60 131
4.10.89–90 42n20, 129
4.10.90 44n29
4.10.99–100 20n16, 53
4.10.101 129n24
4.10.117–118 200n91
4.10.119–132 126n15
4.10.121–122 191n58
4.10.125–132 213n28
4.10.127–132 204n4
4.10.129 144
4.16 205n6
5.1.3 180n31
5.1.3–4 200
5.1.5–6 13n47, 23
5.1.5–7 165
5.1.11–14 13n48
5.1.13–14 12n44, 166n95
5.1.23 23n27
5.1.27 199
5.1.28–30 199n86
5.1.33–34 200n91
5.1.47–48 166n95
5.1.53–54 195n74
5.1.55–56 194n71
5.1.69 200
5.1.69–74 14n49
5.1.75–76 191n58
5.1.79–80 137n36
5.2.15 194n71
5.2.17 20n15, 44n29
5.2.33 43n26, 43n27
5.2.35–36 83
5.2.45–48 132
5.2.46 162n89
5.2.53–54 132
5.2.55 59n84, 64n6, 203n1
5.2.55–56 132
5.2.55–58 42n20
5.2.57 40
5.2.57–58 51n57, 132
5.2.59 133
5.2.60 43n25
5.2.77–78 133
5.3.1–2 144
5.3.4 145
5.3.5–6 144
5.3.15 154n68
5.3.25 134n31
5.3.27–31 145
5.3.31 144
5.3.33 154n68
5.3.33–34 145

5.3.35 145
5.3.39–40 146
5.3.45–46 146
5.3.50 145
5.3.52 146
5.3.58 146
5.4.18 43n26, 44n29
5.4.21–22 59n84, 203n1
5.4.22 64n6
5.4.25–26 194n73
5.5.3 184n39
5.5.51–52 183n35, 184n39
5.5.63 59n83
5.6.17 43n26
5.6.19–20 146n52, 188n52
5.6.21 43n23, 43n25
5.6.25–26 194n73
5.7.5–6 53n71
5.7.17–22 147
5.7.22 148
5.7.25–32 149
5.7.31–32 58n81
5.7.43–44 209n20
5.7.45–46 148n55
5.7.47 134n31
5.7.47–48 78n57, 134
5.7.49–50 148n55
5.7.52 148
5.7.55–56 14n49, 146
5.7.56 148, 210n21
5.7.57–58 149n58
5.7.60 200n90
5.7.63–64 148
5.7.65–68 198n84
5.7.67–68 148
5.8 4n12, 49n48, 185n40, 207n12
5.8.23 43n25, 44n29
5.8.23–24 42n20
5.8.24 43n26
5.8.27–28 119n71
5.9.1 152
5.9.3 152
5.9.5–10 152
5.9.11 59n84, 64n6
5.9.11–12 152
5.9.13 203n1
5.9.15–19 151n64
5.9.19 12n44
5.9.31 134n31
5.10.3–52 190
5.10.43–44 135
5.11 61
5.11.9–10 42n20, 51n61
5.11.10 43n26
5.11.11 37, 119
5.11.11–12 59
5.11.15 136
5.11.17 43n25, 44n29, 189n54
5.11.21 20n15, 42n20
5.11.21–22 40, 51n57, 136
5.11.23–30 86n70
5.12.10 52n64
5.12.14 206n7
5.12.21–22 199n86
5.12.33–34 14n49
5.12.36 180n31, 200n90, 210n21
5.12.45–46 58n81
5.12.67–68 20n16
5.14.5–6 182n34, 204n4, 213n28
5.14.33–42 204n4, 213n28
5.14.35–38 183n35

Paulus

Digesta
4.1.2 42n22
9.2.31 43n27

Persius

5.1–4 176n21

Plautus

Cistellaria
20 123

Miles Gloriosus
210–212 48n42
911 32n57

(Plautus, cont.)

Persa
554–560 44n29

Pliny the Elder

Naturalis Historia
3.17 208n16
7.149 17n2
28.18 47n39
32.152 52
36.101 208n16

Pliny the Younger

Epistulae
6.31 38n1

Plutarch

Moralia
Conjugal Precepts
21 (141A) 173n16
On Exile 15
(605D) 192n58

Julius Caesar
28 98n22
50–51 98n22

Polybius

34.4.1 172n10

Pomponius

Digesta
44.7.57 42n22

Propertius

2.1.25–26 66n13
2.7.5 66n13
2.10 66n13
2.10.19–20 153n67
2.25.12 195n74
3.4.1 66, 66n13
3.11.55–56 72
3.11.66 66n13
4.1 112n61
4.6.1–2 153
4.6.37–38 81n63
4.11.59–60 66n13
4.11.60 66

Proteas Zeugmatites

Etymologicum Magnum
513.49 187n46

Pseudo-Asconius

ad Cic. *Ver.*
1.29 48n41

Publilius Syrus

Sententiae
F19 80n61

Quintillian

Institutio Oratoria
10.1.88 198n83
10.1.91 157, 157n78
12.11.21 171

Rhetorica ad Herennium

1.24 48n44
2.19 48n44

Sappho

32 (Lobel-Page)
112n61

Scaevola

Digesta
46.3.102.3 42n22

Seneca

Dialogi

(de Prouidentia)
1.4.6 189n53

(Consolatio ad Polybium)
11.18.9 149n58

(Consolatio ad Heluiam)
12.6.1–2 191n58
12.8.2–6 191n58

Hercules Furens
1237–1238 44n28, 150n62

SENECA THE ELDER

Controversiae
10, praef.
4–10 45n33

SERVIUS

In Vergilium Commentarius
Verg. *G.* 1.269 123

STATIUS

Silvae
1.2.254–255 52
4.1 66n15

STRABO

Geography
1.2 171
11.2.12–13 187n44
17.3.24 187n44

SUETONIUS

Augustus
7.2–3 103n43
33.1–3 37n1
51.2 37n1
58.1 73n40
69.1–2 69
85 193n69

Claudius
11.2 99n27

Iulius
6.1–2 99n25

Tiberius
16.1 206n10

TACITUS

Annales
1.5 75n48
1.72 45, 46n35, 49
1.73 101n39
2.50 46n35
3.10 38n1
3.24 46n35
3.49–51 18n8
4.21 51
11.2 38n1

TERENCE

Hecyra
387 123

THUCYDIDES

1.21.1 33n60
1.22.4 33n60

TIBULLUS

2.5 113n63
2.5.114–115 153n66

ULPIAN

Digesta
1.1.1.2 40n12
18.1.9 42n22

VARRO

Antiquitates Rerum Divinarum (ed. Cardauns)
fr. 4 107n51
fr. 2a 108
fr. 10 109
fr. 20 76n49, 95

De Lingua Latina
6.29–30 124n7

VELLEIUS PATERCULUS

2.89.1–2 67n21

Vergil

Aeneis
1.65 72
1.198–199 189n54
1.286–288 65n11
1.543 124
2.157–159 123n5
6.625–626 176n23
6.756–892 66
9.641 65n11
12.99 174n18

Eclogae
1.6–8 65n11, 85
1.23 174, 174n19
1.24–27 175
1.40–46 65n11, 86

Georgica
1.24–42 65n11, 76
1.26 80n60
1.268–269 122
1.503–504 65n11
2.43–44 176n23
2.173–176 153n67
2.193–196 153n67
3.16 65n11
3.349–383 209
4.176 174n19
4.520–522 153n67

Zenobius (*paroemiographus*)

Zen. vulg. Proverbia (ed. Leutsch & Schneidewin)
4.43 173n16

INDEX VERBORUM[*]

Greek

ἀοίδιμοι, 183, 189
ἀρετή, 113
ἄσκησις, 199n85

δίκη, 192n59

θεὸς ἐπιφανής, 77, 85. See also *deus praesens*
θυμός, 192n62

Ἰλιὰς κακῶν, 173

κατὰ λεπτόν, 174
κλέος, 165 (κλέα ἀνδρῶν), 181, 189, 198
κότος (κοτέω), 192n62, 194n70

μῆνις, 192, 193(n65), 194n70
μῆτις, 197, 201
μοῖρα, 192
μόρος (κακός), 183
μῦθος, 33n60
μυρία κακά, 173

νόστος 11n41, 169n2, 179

Ὀδυσσεύς / ὀδύσασθαι, 192
ὄπις θεῶν, 192n59
ὀργή, 192n62

πληθύς, 176
ποιητής, 31n54
πόνος, 174
πρέπον, 209n20

σεβαστός, 103n43

τέχνη, 199n85, 201

φυγή, 11n41, 169n2
φύσις (εὐφυία), 199n85

χόλος, 192n62, 194n70

Latin

aedes, 104
aitia, 164
amplificatio, 179
antistes, 107, 110, 112
apologia, 62
ara (*arae*), 94n6; *ara pacis*, 97
arbiter artis, 88
ars, 197–201
asperitas loci, 209n20
astutia, 198n83
augur, 111
augustus (*augurium*, *augere*), 101, 103n43, 130n27. *See also* Augustus *in Index Rerum*

calliditas (*callidus*), 198n83

[*] References to footnotes *without* parentheses indicate that the entry is found *only* in the footnotes. Those *with* parentheses indicate that in addition to within the text proper there is *also* relevant information in the footnotes.

carmen (*carmina*), 45–47, 57, 62, 124–125 (*turpe*), 200; confused with *crimen*, 55–58; *c. perpetuum*, 57, 152. See also *duo crimina*
casus, 43n27
clementia, 83
collegium poetarum, 144
copia, 190
corpus, 214
crimen, 20, 43, 46n36, 55, 57–59, 129. See also *carmen*; *duo crimina*
culpa, 42–44, 128, 142; *culpare*, 119
custodes Vrbis, 73

debitor uitae, 6n21, 59n84, 64n6
delectare, 33
delictum, 42–43, 50
deportatio, 51n59, 207
deus (*di*), 66, 75n46, 85n69, 91, 95, 120 (*dei fabulosi*), 121, 163, 193; *deus praesens*, 77–78, 84–92, 102. See also *diuus*
dicta, 48
dictator, 98
dignus, 69n29
diuus, 28, 85n69, 131 (*Caesar*), 194; *diuus praesens*, 77(n52)–78, 99 (*Iulius*)
dolus (*dolosus*), 43n24 & 27, 198n82
domi nobilis, 18
dulce, 33
duo crimina, *carmen et error*, 20, 38–39, 43, 46, 54–55, 57, 62. See also *carmen*; *crimen*; *error*

error, 38, 40, 42–45, 50, 53–55, 59n83, 60, 62, 128–129, 133, 142, 150n62, 195–196. See also *duo crimina*
exemplum (*exempla*), 73, 82, 169, 185, 210
exilium, 4n14, 40, 51–52, 207
exul, 4n14, 11, 20n15, 51, 136, 143, 152–153, 169
exulare, 4n14

fabula (*fabulosa*), 179–181
facinus, 42, 44, 129, 196
fari, 124. See also *fas*
fas, 11, 121–133, 140–141, 145, 152–153, 156, 162–163, 169, 203. See also *fari*; *fasti*; *ius*; *nefas*
fasti, 124. See also *fas*
ficta, 179–181
fides, 175n20
flagitium, 44n28
flamen, 99
fuga, 4n14

genius (*Augusti*), 100
grande, 174

hariolus, 127n19

ignorantia, 42
illacrimabilis, 165
imperium, 72; *i. Caesaris*, 9, 25; *i. proconsulare maius*, 46n35; *i. Romanum*, 64
ingenium (*ingeniosus*), 88, 114, 139–140, 156, 161, 177, 197–201, 213
iniuria, 48
inscius, 196
ira, 75n46, 86n72, 116, 143, 191–194, 206n7
iubeo (*iubere*), 128(n23), 141
iudex, 38–39, 121, 128, 132, 137
iudicium publicum, 37n1
ius, 11, 121–123, 128, 132–141, 152–153, 156, 162, 169, 192, 203, 213. See also *fas*
iustus, 122, 141, 143

labor, 174
lares compitales, 100–101
laudes Caesaris, 155
lego, 213–214
lex (*leges*), 11, 121, 133–135, 137, 139, 141, 203
libertas, 175
licentia, *fecunda uatum*, 31n54, 32, 180n31
limes, 51

maiestas, 18n8, 29, 45–46, 48–49
maleficium, 44n28
materia, 176, 180
mens, 138, 148n56; *mentis oculus*, 138n38
miser, 21, 187
moderatio, 102
monumentum, 167
mos (*mores*), 141
municipium, 18 (*Sulmo*), 101

nefas, 44n28, 129n24, 196. See also *fas*
negotium, 41
numen, 78, 80, 83, 88, 91–92(n81), 115, 121, 193

occentare, 47n39
officium uatum, 112

parens (*patriae*), 73, 106
paruum, 174
pater (*patriae*), 28, 64, 73 (*paterfamilias*), 74, 106
pax, 135n32
peccatum (*peccare*), 43, 44n28
persona, 28; *persona propria*, 170
pietas, 105, 115, 118
pium, 126, 128–129
poena, 37, 119, 125
poeta, and *princeps*, 41, 110, 138n37, 153, 157n78, 169; *poeta doctus*, 13, 114, 165, 177; *poeta ludens*, 61
pompa circensis, 99n27
pontifex maximus, 111
posteritas, 13, 29. *See also* posterity *in Index Rerum*
princeps, passim; and *poeta*, 41, 110, 138n37, 153, 157n78, 169; *principes ciuitatis*, 48; *principes uiri*, 112; *principis artes*, 71; *principis ira*, 191–193n66, 206n7. *See also* Augustus *in Index Rerum*
probrum, 44n28
prodesse, 33
profugus, 4n14

quindecemuir, 111

rector patriae, 74
recusatio, 163
relegatio, 45, 46n35, 51–52, 200, 207, 211
relegatus, 20n15, 37, 51, 136
res, 41; *res publica*, 64, 99, 142n43
reus, 39, 56

sacer (*sacrum, sacra*), 94n5–6, 103(n44), 114, 143, 145, 153(n66)–155, 161–163
sacro (*sacrarunt*), 26, 114
sceleratus, 42
scelus, 42, 44, 129, 150n62, 195–196
sermo, 88; *sermo absentis*, 3n7, 137n36
sodalis, 155
sphragis, 79, 212

tempora, 94n6
theologia tripertita, 11, 93, 107–111, 116–118
trias exulum (Cicero, Ovid, Seneca), 39n9
turpe (*carmen*), 46, 124–125

uates, 11, 26, 32, 34, 40, 71, 83, 107, 112, 114, 126–127, 139, 141, 143–148, 151–165, 169, 182–183, 203, 214. See also *Licentia*
uersutia, 198n83
uicus, 101
uirtus, 113
uita, 200
uotum, 89–90
utile, 33
utilitas, 34n64

INDEX RERUM*

absence (vs. presence), 3, 15, 84, 86, 121, 135, 137, 146, 158. *See also* presence; *sermo absentis* in *Index Verborum*
Achaei, 186, 187n44
Achilles, 33, 73, 128n23, 165, 188n49, 191–194(n70–71). *See also* Telephus
Actaeon, 36, 195–197
Actium, battle of, 97n17, 99
Aegeus, 73
Aeneas, 35, 97, 174, 189
Aeschylus, 192n59
Agamemnon, 27n36, 66, 73, 165–166
Agrippa, M. Vipsanius, 147n54, 207–208
Ajax, 193n69, 198n82, 201n93
Alcaeus, 39
Alcinous, 180, 185n40, 197
Alexander the Great, 85n68, 113n63
Amor, 53n71, 83n65, 114n64, 148, 184n38. *See also* Ovid: works, *Amores*
Anchises, 66
Andromache, 194n71
Apollo, 68, 71, 114, 145n50, 153, 154n68
apotheosis, of Augustus, 26, 29, 114; of Julius Caesar, 28n41, 31. *See also under* Augustus; deification
Aristotle (Aristotelian), 33n60, 181, 211
Atreus, 73
Augustine, St., 47, 109, 111, 118–119
Augustus Caesar, *princeps*
– anger: 5, 11n41, 13–14, 59n83, 82, 91–92, 104, 116, 132, 136n33, 143, 146, 151n63, 177n25, 179, 191–194, 203n1, 205–206, 209; as vengeful, 28, 60. See also under *ira* in *Index Verborum*
– center of religious discourse, 10, 24, 63, 93, 97, 102, 111, 115, 118, 164. *See also* religion
– death, 79, 104, 111, 115, 156, 162, 193n69
– deification, 10, 26, 31, 33n60, 63–70 passim, 86, 103–106, 111n60, 116–118, 155n72, 164, 210
– divinity (general): 10, 28, 57, 59–68, 70, 77–93, 99, 102, 105–106, 111, 116, 118–120, 121, 129–133, 141, 164, 177n25, 179, 183, 191–195, 205–206, 210; able to exact guilt, 60–62, 119–120 (*viz.* fear), 133; as *deus praesens*, 77–78, 84–92; dual nature (human and divine), 9, 61, 63, 74–76, 86, 194; like Achilles, 34, 194; like Jupiter, 6, 10, 36, 63–64, 67–68, 72–74, 76–78, 80–81, 92, 104, 119n71, 132–133, 142, 145, 179, 183, 191; shrine to, 74n44, 75n47, 93, 105; worship of, 9–10, 26, 28, 63, 66n16, 78–79, 82, 87–92, 96–97, 101–107, 111–116, 118, 153. *See also* cult of the Caesars

* References to footnotes *without* parentheses indicate that the entry is found *only* in the footnotes. Those *with* parentheses indicate that in addition to within the text proper there is *also* relevant information in the footnotes.

Aug. (*cont.*)
– family: 10, 23–24, 28, 57n79, 63, 65, 68–72, 74n44, 98n20, 101, 103, 105–106, 113, 115–116, 118, 128–129, 137, 155, 158, 164, 205–206; household, 103n44, 122, 153n65, 158, 195n77. *See also* Gaius, Germanicus, Livia, Lucius, Tiberius
– imperial rule: autocratic, 18, 45, 52; final phase of, 7, 45, 67, 124; succession of, 7n28, 23, 111
– and law: arbiter of Roman law, 9, 24–25, 74, 80, 84, 86, 122, 127–128, 136, 137n35, 138(n37), 139, 141, 148; free speech, 125; as judge (*iudex*), 38–39, 59, 121, 128, 132, 137; privately wronged by Ovid, 39–40, 50–51, 56, 129, 131, 133, 142, 210; prosecution of *dicta*, 48
– power over Ovid's life, 6(n21), 59, 64, 136, 153, 203
– private and public concerns, 23, 39–40, 50–51, 96n13, 101–102, 115, 129, 131–133, 142, 158
– symbolic embodiment of Rome, 89, 142, 150, 152
– titles, 28, 64, 73–74(n44), 92, 102–103, 111, 115, 122, 130, 141–143
Aulus Gellius, 47, 122n3

Bacchus, 26, 144–146. *See also* Liber
banishment. *See* exile
Bienek, Horst, 149n59
Breytenbach, Breyten, 62n89
Briseis, 184n36
Brodsky, Joseph, 149n59

Caepio and Murena, conspiracy of, 17
Caesars, divinity of, 90–91, 98, 130, 150. *See also* Augustus; Claudius; cult of the Caesars; Drusus; Gaius; Germanicus; Julius; Lucius; Tiberius
Callimachus, 85, 153–154, 174, 199n85
Calypso, 188
Camillus, M. Furius, 73
Capaneus, 145
Carus, friend of Ovid, 155
Cassius Severus, 45, 46n34, 48–49, 51
Castor (& Pollux), 88.
catalogue. *See under* Ovid: poetry of exile
center (vs. periphery), 5, 10, 25, 63, 84, 121, 206–207. *See also* marginality; periphery
Cerastae, metamorphosis of, 212n26
Chaos, 26, 113
Charybdis, 186
Cicero, Marcus Tullius, 32, 67, 73, 76
Cimmerian land, 187(n46)
Claudius Caesar, 38n1
Clay, Jenny Strauss, 193
Clutorius Priscus, 18n8
Constanța, Romania, 18. *See also* Tomis
Coralli, 27n38, 209
Corinth, 82, 113n63
Cornelia, 66
Cotta Maximus, (M. Aurelius Cotta Maximus Messalinus), 38, 69–70, 88, 143n44, 151, 182n34
Cotys, 185n40
Crete, 51
Croesus, 188
cult of the Caesars, 9–10, 24n30, 63, 66n16, 78, 87, 88n75, 92–93, 96, 98(n20)–107, 116, 150, 193n66; literary prototype in Ovid, 10, 93, 96. *See also under* Augustus: divinity; ritual
Cupid. *See* Amor

Daedalus, 82, 195n76
death, motif of, 12(n44), 59, 61, 81n62, 145, 146n52, 151n63,

159, 165–166, 174n18, 177n24, 188(n52), 191n58, 200–201, 204–205, 211–213. *See also* epitaph; exile; Styx; suicide
deification, of emperor, 10, 26–27, 28n41, 29, 31, 33n60, 59, 63–70 passim, 86, 98, 103, 106, 111n60, 155n72, 164, 210. *See also under* Augustus: deification; cult of the Caesars
deterioration, motif of, 14(50), 149(n60)–150, 199–200(n88)
Diana, 195–196
Dolon, 188n49
Domitian, 157
Drusus Caesar, son of Tiberius, 18n8, 70–71

edge, of empire. *See* center; exile; marginality; periphery
elegy, meter of, 13, 21–23, 50n52, 58n82, 65n9, 165–166, 170, 172, 174, 181, 187(n48); as *werbende Dichtung*, 27. *See also* genre; letter
Elpenor, 187–188
emperor cult. *See* cult of the Caesars
Ennius, 72, 127n19, 171, 176, 198–199
Epicurus, 137n36
epistle, elegiac. *See* letter
epitaph, in Ovid's exile poetry, 12n44, 13, 139, 166, 198
Eteocles, 193n69
exile
– general: as alternative to execution, 12, 40, 205; as geographical separation (from home), 11, 19, 121, 131, 136, 140, 152, 159, 181, 188, 191, 207–210
– of Ovid: historicity, 5, 19–21, 52–53, 55; as intellectual refuge, 5, 15, 25, 121, 163, 211; likened to death, 12(n44), 59, 61, 81n62, 145, 146n52, 151n63, 159, 165–166, 174n18, 177n24, 188(n52), 191n58, 200–201, 204–205, 211–213 (*see also* death); as metaphorical motif, 4–5, 11–13, 15, 25, 39n9, 54–55, 121, 136, 140, 159, 163–164, 200–201, 210, 212; mythological framework, 10, 63–64, 68, 80–84, 91–92, 98, 105–107, 111, 115, 117, 120; misery in, 3, 13, 22n25, 28, 148, 198n84; poetic representation, 2–3, 8, 11, 19–20, 23, 25, 28, 64, 130, 140, 148–150, 159, 162, 170, 173n15, 174n18, 179–181, 197, 200, 209–210; as punishment (generally), 1, 3, 5, 9, 12, 15, 27, 36, 37–41, 56, 58–62, 74, 84, 86, 93, 104, 119–120, 125, 132–133, 137–140, 142, 151, 195–197, 205, 210–211, 214; as punishment (in legal terms), 45–52; as torture, 207–209. *See also* marginality; Ovid: exile; *exilium* in Index Verborum
Eumedes, 188n49
Euryalus, 194n73

Fabius, Paullus F. Maximus, 74–76
Fabius, Q. F. Maximus *Cunctator*, 73
Fears, Rufus, 68
Feeney, Denis, 96, 124
fiction, vs. reality, 22n25, 34–35 (of myth), 90, 140, 180, 210; of Ovid's exile, 20–21(n19); *Fiktionsthese*, 20n18. See also *fabula*; *ficta* in *Index Verborum*
forgetfulness, theme of, 148–150, 198n84
friendship, theme of, 194(n73)
funerary epigram. *See* epitaph

Gaius Caesar, 18n8, 71, 100n33
Gallus, C. Cornelius, 45n32
genre, 13, 21–23, 50n52, 58n82, 66, 165, 172, 174. *See also* elegy; panegyric
Germanicus Caesar, 18n8, 26–27, 70–71, 86n70, 107, 110–115, 118, 122, 154n68, 155–159, 161–162, 164, 199, 203n1

Getae (Getan, Getic), 27n38, 33n60, 52n64, 91, 146n52, 148, 158–159, 178, 184, 199, 209; language of, 106n48, 147(n53), 155
Giants, 26, 113
Gibbon, Edward, 211n24
Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von, 174n18
Goold, G.P., 53
Gradel, Ittai, 100–101
Graecinus, 1, 104, 138
Graf, Fritz, 35
guilt. *See under* Augustus: divinity; Ovid: Augustus; punishment

Habinek, Thomas, 158
Hall, John Barrie, 56–58, 62
Heaney, Seamus, 1, 2, 7, 8, 12, 15, 30, 151, 204–205
Hector, 183, 189, 194n71
Helen, 182–183, 189
Heniochi, 186, 187n44
Hercules, 26, 66, 88, 113
Herodotus, 147
Hesiod, 30, 32, 74, 85, 113, 192n59
Hippolytus, 193n69
history: and myth, 23, 25–36, 169, 181, 214; and poetry, 4, 6, 8, 15, 17–20, 23–25, 30–32, 35–36, 40, 49, 52, 92, 97, 159, 163, 187n45, 193n66, 201, 204, 205n5; public and private in, 39–40, 50; shifts in Roman, 7–10, 63, 97, 111, 118, 150, 159, 164. *See also* exile, of Ovid: historicity
Hofmann, Heinz, 20
Homer, 11, 30, 64, 72, 74, 77–78, 81, 113, 144, 165–167, 169, 171–192, 205; as "Getic" poet, 184; *Iliad*, 81, 169, 173–176, 184, 190–192; *Odyssey*, 66, 184, 191–192; Ovid and, 169, 171–201; paradigmatic poet in antiquity, 169, 172; suffering in, 11, 172–174, 176–179, 181–183, 185–186, 188–192, 197–198, 201
Horace, 17, 18n5, 22, 28, 33, 47n39, 62n88, 65, 67, 69n29, 72–73, 74n45, 75n48, 76–78, 82–83, 87–88, 114, 127, 143–144, 165–167, 171, 198n82, 200n89
humor. *See* Ovid: poetry of exile
Hyginus, Palatine librarian, 144

Icarus, 83n64, 195n76
Iliad. *See* Homer
Illyrian Revolt, Great, 206
immortality, poetic, 4–5, 12, 27(n36)–28, 65, 82–84, 86, 104, 112, 113, 115–116, 165–166, 181–183, 190, 201, 203–204(n2), 210, 212–214, 216
imperial cult. *See* cult of the Caesars
Irus, 188
Ithaca, 11n41, 178, 188, 191n57, 198n81

Julia, daughter of Augustus, 51
Julia, granddaughter of Augustus, 53n69
Julius Caesar, 26n35, 27, 31, 65n11, 67, 71, 73, 85n68, 95, 97–99, 107
Junius Silanus, 53n69
Juno, 82, 111; Livia as, 68, 69n28
Jupiter, 11n41, 31, 36, 66n13, 67–68, 71–73, 80–81, 91–92, 94, 99n28, 104, 106, 111, 113, 137, 145, 155n72, 160n84, 162n89; compared to Augustus, 6, 10, 36, 63–64, 67–68, 72–74, 76–78, 80–81, 92, 104, 119n71, 132–133, 142, 145, 179, 183, 191. *See also* Augustus: divinity
justice. *See* law; Ovid: law; punishment

Kenney, E.J., 41, 44, 170
Koestler, Arthur, 62n89

Labienus, T., 45, 46n34
Laestrygonians, 187
Laodamia, 183n35

law, Roman
– general: 2, 9, 24–25, 37–60 passim, 116, 121, 134, 169; Ovid's representation of, 8, 38, 40, 44, 57, 128, 133–135, 169, 204
– specific: against slander, 48–49; contrast between *fas* and *ius*, 11, 121–123, 128, 132–133, 140–141, 152–153, 156, 169, 203; *ius* and *lex* as complements, 121, 133–135, 139, 141, 203; liability, 43(n27), 50; public and private, 40n12, 50–51, 56–57, 142; tort, 42. *See also* Augustus: and law; Ovid: and law; punishment; redress, legal; Tomis; *and individual legal terms in Index Verborum*
letter, form of, 6, 21–24, 131, 137(n36)–138, 170, 174; private letter, public lament, 24, 101–102, 131. *See also* genre
Leucothea, 179n27
Liber (Libera, *Liberalia*), 26, 88, 113, 144–146. *See also* Bacchus
Lieberg, Godo, 29–31
Livia, 68–70, 88, 90n78. *See also* Juno
Livius Andronicus, 171
Lucilius (*poeta*), 22
Lucius Caesar, 71, 100n33
Lucretius, 127n19, 137n36
Lycurgus, 146

Macer, companion of Ovid, 154
Mahon, Derek, 212n27
Mann, Thomas, 149n59
map of Agrippa, 147n54, 207–208
Marcellus, M. Claudius (266–208 BC), 99n23
Marcellus, M. Claudius (42–23 BC), 97n17
marginality: figurative, 4, 15, 19, 25, 29, 64, 135, 138, 159, 162, 209; literal space on edge of empire, 10, 14, 19, 29, 63–64, 75, 83–84, 102, 127, 135, 162, 203, 205, 208–209. *See also* center; periphery
Marius, 73
Mark Antony, 99, 113n63
Mars, 68, 99n28, 184n36, 213; temple of, 117, 208
Medea, 82
Meliboeus, 85
Messalla Messallinus. *See* Valerius
metamorphosis, Ovid's own, 12, 159, 212n26, 214
metaphor. *See under* exile; Ovid: metaphorical motif of exile
Metellus, L. Caecilius, 108
Metrodorus of Scepsis, 49n48
Miletus, 18
Minerva, 111
Moesia, province of, 19, 206
Mummius, L. (*cos.* 146 BC), 113n63
Munatius Plancus, 103n43
myth, exemplarity of, 12n42, 35(n66)–36, 82, 169–170, 177(n25–26), 185, 194–196, 210; and history, 23, 25–36, 169, 181, 214; paradox of, 35–36; and ritual, 9, 78 (cult), 92, 95–98, 105. *See also under* Ovid: mythologizing

Naevius (*poeta*), 47–48
Naso. *See under* Ovid: *poeta*
Nausicaa, 185n40
Neptune, 11n41, 178–179. *See also* Poseidon
Nestor, 177n26, 190n55
Nicolet, Claude, 208
Nisus, 194n73

Octavian, 85, 99. *See also* Augustus
Odysseus. *See* Ulysses
Odyssey. *See* Homer
Oechalia, 26
Oedipus, 177n24, 197n80
Oliensis, Ellen, 2
Orestes, 79, 194n73

Ovid
– Augustus: guilt before, 3, 14, 57–62, 64, 119–120, 133, 143; life beholden to, 6(n21), 59, 136, 153; professed devotion to, 10, 93, 102, 104–105, 154; rhetorical stance towards, 9–10, 28, 57n79, 120, 133, 210–211; whether openly opposed to, 2, 28; worship of, 9–10, 26, 28, 78–79, 90–93, 96–98, 102–107, 111–116, 118, 132, 153. See also *uates* in *Index Verborum*
– exile: geographical separation, 11, 19, 121, 131, 133, 136, 152, 163, 206–208, 210; historicity of, 5, 19–21, 52–53, 55; literary construct, 5, 19, 36, 40, 64, 81n63, 140, 163–164, 175n20, 197, 204; peculiarity of, 37–39, 48–50, 52–55, 91; poetic representation of, 2–3, 8, 11, 19–20, 23, 25, 28, 64, 130, 140, 148–150, 159, 162, 170, 173n15, 174n18, 179–181, 197, 200, 209–210. *See also* death; exile
– Homer, 169, 171–201. *See also* Homer
– law (general): 2, 8–9, 24–25, 37–60 passim, 116, 121, 133–135, 169, 204; as legal scholar, 41; legal status in exile, 8, 31–32, 39–40, 42, 44, 52, 57–58, 120, 128–129, 132–133, 135–136, 152, 160. *See also* law; *and individual legal terms in Index Verborum*
– metaphorical motif of exile, 4–5, 11–13, 15, 25, 39n9, 54–55, 121, 136, 140, 159, 163–164, 200–201, 210, 212
– mythologizing (mythological framework): 9–10, 30, 63–64, 68, 80–84, 91–92, 98, 105–107, 111, 115, 117, 120
– *poeta*: as "Getic" poet, 33n60, 106n48, 147(n53), 155, 159, 199; *persona* of Naso, 115, 161, 169–170, 189; place in literary tradition, 7, 11, 15, 81n63, 164, 175, 198, 201, 209; vs. *princeps*, 41, 110, 127, 130, 138n37, 141, 153, 169. See also under *poeta*; *uates* in *Index Verborum*
– poetic redress, 1–2, 6–7, 12, 15, 30, 138, 151, 163, 204–205, 216. *See also* Heaney, Seamus; redress
– poetry of exile: catalogue in, 25, 27, 29, 31, 52n64, 73(n42), 113, 177n25, 195n76, 205n6, 215; defense of poetry itself, 11, 15, 33, 141, 163, 184; deterioriation as theme in, 14(n50), 149(n60), 199–200(n88); didactic intent of, 12, 19–20, 120, 211; epitaph in, 12n44, 13, 139, 166, 198; humor of, 3, 6–7, 91, 147–148, 164n93; as intellectual refuge, 5, 15, 25, 121, 163, 211; lament in, 4, 11, 15, 23, 41, 131, 164–166, 205, 211; oblivion in, 148–149, 198n84; as panegyric, 66, 150, 155n72; as poetic (counter-)reality, 6, 29–31, 36, 140, 151, 163, 205(n5); public and private in, 24, 39–40, 50–51, 56, 131–133, 158; reflection of exiled poet, 3, 28, 140, 200, 207, 210, 214; for reprieve, 5, 8, 27(n39), 66, 82, 84, 89, 92, 104, 115, 156(n74), 161, 204; surface vs. subtext (essence) in, 3, 6, 14–15, 24, 28, 86, 131–132, 215; uniqueness of, 14n52, 24(n28)–25, 211(n24). *See also under* elegy; letter; marginality; poetry; redress
– punishment (generally): 1, 3, 5, 9, 12, 15, 27, 36, 37–41, 56, 58–62, 74, 84, 86, 93, 104, 119–120, 125, 132–133, 137–140, 142, 151, 195–197, 205, 210–211, 214; in legal terms, 41, 45–52
– religion (general): 2, 10–12, 24, 29, 92, 93–107 passim, 115, 120, 162–164, 169, 204, 216;

authority on Roman, 94 (*Fasti*); ritual use of prayer, 10, 79, 83, 89, 91–92, 102–106, 114, 126, 129–130, 132, 152
– sacred status (as poet), 11, 107, 121, 127, 130, 140, 143, 151–152, 154–155, 162–165. See also *uates*; *sacer* in *Index Verborum*
– wife, 75n47, 82–83, 132, 136, 151n63, 174n18, 182–183(n35), 194n71
– works:
Amores, 32, 34, 147, 149n60, 154, 170n3
Ars Amatoria, 20, 34, 38, 46, 49, 53n69, 55, 58, 94–95, 119, 124–125, 150, 170n3, 176, 180
Epistulae ex Ponto, passim; dating of, 5n19
Fasti, 7, 9–10, 17, 23n27, 50, 63, 71–72, 79–80, 94, 96, 107n49, 124–127, 131, 143, 156, 162–163, 176; revised in exile, 5n19, 125(n13)
Heroides, 5n19, 22–23, 41, 125, 170
Ibis, 4, 160, 207n12
Metamorphoses, 7, 9–10, 12, 17, 31, 35, 50, 63, 73, 79–80, 96, 114, 124n8, 125–127, 141, 170, 172n11, 176, 181, 182n34; exilic recension of, 125n13, 126n15, 195(n79)–196, 212–215
Remedia Amoris, 149n60, 170n3
Tristia, passim; dating of, 5n19

Palamedes, 198n82
panegyric, Ovid's place in genre of, 66, 150, 155n72, 157
Pannonia (Pannonian), 156, 206
paradox, of myth, 35; of Ovid's exile, 5; of punishment, 84. *See also under* Ovid: exile
Paris, 173n16, 183
Patroclus, 194n73
Peleus, 73
Penelope, 182, 183n35
Pentheus, 146
Perilla, perhaps pseudonym, 39n10, 139, 154n68
Perillus (and Phalaris), 195
periphery, 5, 10, 63, 75, 84, 121, 206, 207. *See also* center; marginality
Perseus, 82
Petrarch, 29n44
Phaeacia, 197
Piacches, 186(n43)
Pindar, 192n59
Pirithous, 194n73
Plato, 31n54
Pliny the Elder, 52, 208
poetics, Ovidian in exile, 14, 30, 64n5, 66, 170, 183, 190 (*copia*), 193, 196, 200, 212; of personal experience, 172
poetry: creative power of, 25, 27, 29–30, 31n54, 140, 160, 203; defense of, 11, 15, 33, 141, 163, 184 (on trial); and history, 4, 6, 8, 15, 17–20, 23–25, 30–32, 35–36, 40, 49, 52, 92, 97, 159, 163, 187n45, 193n66, 201, 204, 205n5; immortalizing power of, 4–5, 12, 27(n36)–28, 65, 82–84, 86, 104, 112, 113, 115–116, 165–166, 181–183, 190, 201, 203–204(n2), 210, 212–214, 216 (*see also* immortality); as reflection of poet, 3, 28, 140, 200, 207, 210, 214. *See also* marginality; Ovid: poetry of exile
Pohlenz, Max, 195–196
Polynices, 193n69
Polyphemus, 187
Pompeius, Sextus, 100
Poseidon, 82. *See also* Neptune
posterity, in Ovid's exile poetry, 13, 29(n44), 65, 151–152, 165, 203, 212n26
power. *See* poetry: creative power

presence (*vs.* absence), 3, 15, 84, 121, 137, 158; poetic, 3, 15, 84, 137, 146, 164, 204, 211
Pre-Socratics, 192n59
princeps. *See* Augustus Caesar
Priam, 174n18, 194n71
Priscus, Clutorius, 18n8
private. *See* public
Propertius, 22, 66–67, 72, 143–144, 153–154, 165
public vs. private, 23, 39–40, 42–43, 50–51, 56, 63n3, 96n13, 101–102, 115, 129, 131–133, 142, 158, 169, 201, 210
punishment, of exile (generally), 1, 3, 5, 9, 12, 15, 27, 36, 37–41, 56, 58–62, 74, 84, 86, 93, 104, 119–120, 125, 132–133, 137–140, 142, 151, 195–197, 205, 210–211, 214; in legal terms, 41, 45–52; more tolerable than guilt, 59–62, 119–120; paradox of, 84
Pylades, 194n73
Pythagoras, 137n36

Quintilian, 171
Quirinus, 99n28

Rahn, Helmut, 170, 185
Ransmayr, Christoph, 31n53
redress, legal, 50, 138; poetic, 1–2, 6–7, 12, 15, 30, 138, 151, 163, 204–205, 216. *See also* Heaney, Seamus; Ovid: poetry of exile
relegation. *See* exile; *relegatio* in *Index Verborum*
religion, Roman: 2, 10–12, 24, 29, 92, 93–107 passim, 115, 120, 162–164, 169, 204, 216; change and development of, 9–10, 63, 89–90, 92, 96–97, 106–107, 111–112, 117–118, 120, 140, 164; "reading" of in literature, 93–94, 96–98. *See also* Ovid: religion; ritual
repetition, as theme, 6,
ritual, representation of, 10, 90–97, 100, 102–105, 115–116, 204
Romulus, 66, 88
Rosati, Gianpiero, 30
Rufinus, friend adressed by Ovid, 136, 154, 159

Said, Edward, 17, 28n43
Salanus, 154n68, 161, 162n88, 199
Sappho, 144
Sarmatian, 13n48, 14n49, 166n95, 178, 189n52; language, 146–148
Saturn, 73
Scribonia, 69
Scylla, 51n63, 186–187
Scythia (Scythian), 12n44, 158n79, 182n34, 186, 209
Semele, 145
Servius, 85n69, 123
shrine, imperial, 71, 74n44, 75n47, 93, 105. *See also* cult of the Caesars
Statius, 52
Strabo, 171; 187n44
Styx, river, 12n44, 26, 81n62, 151n64, 187
subtext. *See* surface
suicide, 17, 45, 151(n63). *See also* death; exile
Suillius, Ovid's almost son-in-law, 107, 110, 112, 114–115, 118, 162n87
Sulla, 67, 73
Sulmo (*municipium*), 18
surface, vs. subtext (essence) in Ovid's exile poetry, 3, 6, 14–15, 24, 28, 86, 131–132, 215
Syme, Sir Ronald, 17–18, 54, 115, 193

Telegonus, 177n24, 197n80
Telemachus, 191n57
Telephus, 33–34, 36, 85, 193–194, 196. *See also* Achilles
Thebes, 27n36
Theoclymenus, 191n57

theologia tripertita, 11, 93, 107–111, 116–118
Theseus, 73, 194n73
Tiberius Caesar, 7, 38n1, 45n32, 69–70, 88, 90n78, 111–113, 118, 136–137, 138n37, 155n72, 156, 159, 203, 206n10
Tiberius Claudius Nero, 69
Tibullus, 49, 144, 153n66, 165
Titanomachy, 113n63
Tityrus, 85–86
Tomb of Unkowns, USA, 54n72
Tomis (*viz*. Tomi), 5, 10, 13, 18–20, 34, 51, 78, 84, 88–90, 121, 146, 164n93, 165, 186, 190, 200, 205–207; lawlessness of, 78(n57), 134–135; negative image of Rome, 135–136
Trajan, emperor, 38n1
trial, of Ovid, 37–38 (*in camera*), 51; of poetry, 184
Triptolemus, 82
triumph, 137, 153n66, 154, 156–159; mentioned, 99

Ulysses, 11, 85, 169(n2), 175n20, 176–194, 197–201

Weil, Simone, 2n3
Weinstock, Stefan, 98
Wilkes, J.J., 206

Valerius Messalla Messallinus, M., 141n42
Varro, 11, 76, 93, 95, 108–111, 115, 117–119, 124, 127, 162; *Antiquitates*, 107, 110, 118, 127. See also *theologia tripertita*
Venus, 99, 184n36, 193n69
Vergil, 17, 28, 62n88, 65, 67, 72, 76, 87, 97, 122–124, 165, 174, 189; *Aeneid*, 35, 66, 97(n17), 114, 173–174; *Eclogues*, 85, 143, 174–175; *Georgics*, 76, 122–123, 209
Vesta, 69n28
Vestalis, 134, 182n34

Zeus, 72, 78n55, 81, 106, 183, 191–192. *See also* Jupiter

SUPPLEMENTS TO MNEMOSYNE

EDITED BY G.J. BOTER, A. CHANIOTIS, K.M. COLEMAN,
I.J.F. DE JONG AND P.H. SCHRIJVERS

Recent volumes in the series

290. VAN MAL-MAEDER, D. *La fiction des déclamations*. 2007. ISBN 978 90 04 15672 2
291. DE JONG, I.J.F. & R. NÜNLIST (eds.). *Time in Ancient Greek Literature*. Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative, volume 2. 2007. ISBN 978 90 04 16506 9
292. KITZINGER, M.R. *The Choruses of Sophokles'* Antigone *and* Philoktetes. A Dance of Words. 2008. ISBN 978 90 04 16514 4
293. CONWELL, D.H. *Connecting a City to the Sea*. The History of the Athenian Long Walls. 2008. ISBN 978 90 04 16232 7
294. MARKOVIĆ, D. *The Rhetoric of Explanation in Lucretius'* De rerum natura. 2008. ISBN 978 90 04 16796 4
295. GEIGER, J. *The First Hall of Fame*. A Study of the Statues in the *Forum Augustum*. 2008. ISBN 978 90 04 16869 5
296. KIM ON CHONG-GOSSARD, J.H. *Gender and Communication in Euripides' Plays*. Between Song and Silence. 2008. ISBN 978 90 04 16880 0
297. KEULEN, W. *Gellius the Satirist*. Roman Cultural Authority in *Attic Nights*. 2009. ISBN 978 90 04 16986 9
298. MACKAY, E.A. (ed.). *Orality, Literacy, Memory in the Ancient Greek and Roman World*. Orality and Literacy in Ancient Greece, Vol. 7. 2008. ISBN 978 90 04 16991 3
299. HORSFALL, N. *Virgil*, Aeneid *2*. A Commentary. 2008. ISBN 978 90 04 16988 3
300. McKECHNIE, P. & P. GUILLAUME (eds.). *Ptolemy II Philadelphus and his World*. 2008. ISBN 978 90 04 17089 6
301. DE JONGE, C.C. *Between Grammar and Rhetoric*. Dionysius of Halicarnassus on Language, Linguistics and Literature. 2008. ISBN 978 90 04 16677 6
302. SCHMALZ, G.C.R. *Augustan and Julio-Claudian Athens*. A New Epigraphy and Prosopography. 2009. ISBN 978 90 04 17009 4
303. DE LIGT, L. & S.J. NORTHWOOD (eds.). *People, Land, and Politics*. Demographic Developments and the Transformation of Roman Italy, 300 BC-AD 14. 2008. ISBN 978 90 04 17118 3
304. EILERS, C. (ed.). *Diplomats and Diplomacy in the Roman World*. 2009. ISBN 978 90 04 17098 8
305. DEMOEN, K. & D. PRAET (eds.). Theios Sophistès. Essays on Flavius Philostratus' *Vita Apollonii*. 2009. ISBN 978 90 04 17109 1
306. SMOLENAARS, J.J.L., H. VAN DAM & R.R. NAUTA (eds.). *The Poetry of Statius*. 2008. ISBN 978 90 04 17134 3
307. SLUITER, I. & R.M. ROSEN (eds.). *KAKOS, Badness and Anti-Value in Classical Antiquity*. 2009. ISBN 978 90 04 16624 0
308. KOVÁCS, P. *Marcus Aurelius' Rain Miracle and the Marcomannic Wars*. 2009. ISBN 978 90 04 16639 4
309. McGOWAN, M.M. *Ovid in Exile*. Power and Poetic Redress in the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto*. 2009. ISBN 978 90 04 17076 6